WELFARE *in* REVIEW

ICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT · CUB
AN REFUGEE PROGRAM STAFF · CHILDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF
ILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGING · OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUE
LDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF FAMILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGINC
ICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT · CUB
AN REFUGEE PROGRAM STAFF · CHILDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF
ILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGING · OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUE
LDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF FAMILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGINC
FICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT · CUB
AN REFUGEE PROGRAM STAFF · CHILDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF
ILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGING · OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUE
LDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF FAMILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGINC
FICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT · CUB
AN REFUGEE PROGRAM STAFF · CHILDREN'S BUREAU · BUREAU OF
ILY SERVICES · OFFICE OF AGING · OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUE

DOCUMENT
JAN 13 1965
BRIGHAM STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

JANUARY
1965
Vol 3 - No 1

U. S.
DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,
AND
WELFARE
Welfare
Administration

U. S.
DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

Welfare Administration

Children's
Bureau

Bureau of Family
Services

Office of Aging

Office of Juvenile
Delinquency and
Youth Development

Cuban Refugee
Program Staff

WELFARE in REVIEW

Welfare in Review is the official monthly publication of the Welfare Administration. Statements in Review articles do not necessarily reflect official policies of the Welfare Administration.

Welfare in Review is prepared in the Division of Research, Office of the Commissioner, Welfare Administration. Suggestions or comments should be addressed to the Editor, Welfare in Review, Welfare Administration, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D. C. 20201.

Contents of the publication are not copyrighted; any items may be reprinted but citation of Welfare in Review as the source is requested.

Use of funds for printing this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget July 22, 1963.

Welfare in Review is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price $3.00 per year; $1 additional for foreign mailing. 35 cents per single copy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, Secretary

Welfare Administration

ELLEN WINSTON, Commissioner

JOSEPH H. MEYERS, Deputy Commissioner

GENEVIEVE W. CARTER, Director
Division of Research

Volume 3 Number 1

JANUARY 1965

In This Issue

Page

Incapacitated Fathers in AFDC--
A Target for Special Emphasis..... 1

Legislation in the 88th Congress Concerning Welfare Administration
Programs..... 6

Child-Rearing and Family Relationship Patterns of the Very Poor.... 9

Notes..... 5
Publications of Interest..... 20
Program and Operating Statistics... 21

Incapacitated Fathers in AFDC -- A Target for Special Emphasis

ROBERT T. LANSDALE*

THE INCREASING number and proportion of families in the program of aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) in which the father is absent from the home because of divorce, separation, or desertion, or because he is not married to the mother have centered attention upon these families in the recent efforts to provide concerted services. Less emphasis appears to be given to families in which incapacity of the father is the primary cause of dependency. Examination of data presented in the study of the characteristics of AFDC families in late 1961[1] warrants the assertion that within this latter group may lie a fruitful area for projects to enable these fathers "to attain . . . capability for self-support or personal independence," as provided by Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as well as under Title IV, Section 409, of the Social Security Act as amended in 1962.

AFDC families with an incapacitated father, while declining over the years in proportion to those in which the father is absent, have nevertheless shown a steady increase in numbers. Measured by the number of children involved, the increase has been nearly threefold over the past 20 years.[2] Indeed one cannot ignore this group of 160,000 dependent families involving 578,000 children and representing 18 percent of all AFDC families in late 1961.[3]

Two significant characteristics of these families are revealed in the national figures. The first is that the incapacity of the father accounts for both a larger number and a higher proportion of white AFDC families than nonwhite. Among the white families, those with an incapacitated father amounted to 123,000 or 25 percent. The corresponding figure for nonwhite families was 37,550 or 9.4 percent. The second important finding is that AFDC families in which the father is incapacitated involve on the average more children than AFDC families as a whole. While constituting 18 percent of all AFDC families, the families with an incapacitated father include almost 22 percent of all children in AFDC families.[4]

VARIATIONS AMONG THE STATES

The most striking fact that emerges from the State reports is the wide range among the States in the proportion of AFDC families in which incapacity of the father was given as the primary factor of dependency. Against the national figure of 18 percent, the range among the States in late 1961 was from 2.9 percent in Connecticut to 41.4 percent in South Carolina. The father's incapacity was reported as the major

*Consultant, Division of Research, Welfare Administration.

[1]Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration: Characteristics of Families Receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children, November-December 1961. April 1963.

[2]Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration: Trend Report: Graphic Presentation of Public Assistance and Related Data. December 1963.

[3]These figures and those that follow exclude Massachusetts, Oregon, and Guam, whose reports were not received for the 1961 study.

[4]The average number of children per AFDC family in late 1961 was 3.0. By status of fathers, the average numbers were: Dead, 2.7; incapacitated, 3.6; absent from the home, 2.8; unemployed, 3.7.

dependency factor for 25 percent or more of the AFDC families in 10 States and for 20 percent or more in 21 States. In contrast, the percentage was 7.6 or less in seven States.

With regard to race, in two States more than half of the white AFDC families were dependent because of the incapacity of the father, and in 15 States 30 percent or more of the white families were dependent for this reason. In contrast, only one State (South Carolina) showed more than 30 percent of nonwhite AFDC families receiving assistance because of the incapacity of the father, and only five other States (Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, New Mexico) showed a proportion of over 20 percent.

The 21 States with the highest proportion of AFDC families in which incapacity of the father is the primary cause of dependency (20 percent or more) and the seven States with the lowest proportion (7.6 percent or less) are shown in table 1, ranked by percentage from high to low. This table also shows the numbers of such families in these States as well as the proportions of white and nonwhite AFDC families represented.

EXTENT OF RELATED INCOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS

An analysis of the extent of related public assistance and social insurance

Table 1. Number and percent of AFDC families with incapacitated father and percent of white and nonwhite AFDC families with incapacitated father, in 21 States with highest and 7 with lowest proportion of incapacitated father cases, ranked by percentage high to low, late 1961[1]

State	AFDC families with incapacitated fathers			Percent of white AFDC families with incapacitated fathers[2]	Percent of nonwhite AFDC families with incapacitated fathers
	Number	Percent of all AFDC families			
		Percent	Rank		
United States	160,226	18.1	--	25.2	9.4
South Carolina	3,792	41.4	1	56.1	33.3
Arkansas	2,460	36.0	2	47.7	18.3
Georgia	5,908	36.0	3	47.0	24.1
Louisiana	7,115	31.4	4	51.0	22.3
Kentucky	5,871	26.9	5	32.9	4.6
Texas	5,013	25.9	6	31.5	16.5
Arizona	2,322	25.8	7	27.4	23.6
West Virginia	7,770	25.8	8	27.5	9.6
North Carolina	7,175	25.3	9	39.8	14.0
New Mexico	1,847	25.0	10	25.6	21.6
Mississippi	5,033	24.5	11	45.4	17.9
Alabama	5,144	24.1	12	45.0	11.2
Alaska	294	24.0	13	3/	24.4
Virginia	2,358	22.1	14	38.8	10.9
North Dakota	398	21.9	15	23.1	18.8
Pennsylvania	14,449	21.2	16	28.1	11.0
Vermont	278	21.2	17	21.2	3/
Missouri	5,593	21.1	18	24.8	6.1
Kansas	1,328	20.7	19	27.5	7.6
Tennessee	4,663	20.6	20	32.8	3.4
Oklahoma	3,863	20.2	21	30.3	9.0
Delaware	175	7.6	43	13.9	5.4
California	6,162	7.1	44	8.9	4.0
Michigan	2,211	7.1	45	13.6	1.9
New Jersey	1,280	6.5	46	10.4	4.3
Illinois	3,342	6.4	47	15.9	3.0
Nevada	52	3.9	48	4.7	3.4
Connecticut	291	2.9	49	4.0	1.5

1/ No report from Massachusetts, Oregon, and Guam. Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands not included in rank. States with similar percent ranked alphabetically.

2/ Includes families with color unknown.

3/ Not calculated. Base too small.

Source: Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration: Characteristics of Families Receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children, November-December 1961. April 1963.

programs in these States (table 2) throws some light on the reasons for the wide variation in the proportion of incapacitated father cases reported.

It might be surmised that those States reporting a high rate of incapacitated fathers have underdeveloped programs of public assistance for disabled adults, namely, aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to the blind. The reverse is true, however. The majority of the States that showed a high rate of incapacitated fathers in AFDC also showed a proportionately high recipient rate in both APTD and AB in December 1961. Of the 21 States with the highest proportion of AFDC families with an incapacitated father, 14 had a recipient rate in APTD and 13 in AB above the national figure. Nine of these States ranked among the top 10 States in APTD recipient rate. On the other hand, of the seven States with the lowest proportion of incapacitated father cases, six had an APTD recipient rate below the national figure and the seventh had no program in effect in 1961. Three of these latter seven States had an AB recipient rate above the national figure and four were below.

Turning to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, one would anticipate that States having a high proportion of

Table 2. 21 States with highest and 7 States with lowest percent of incapacitated father cases in AFDC with recipient rate and rank in APTD, AB, children of disabled wage earner receiving OASDI, and general assistance, December 1961[1]

State	Rank in percent AFDC families with incapacitated father 2/	APTD recipients per 1,000 population aged 18-64 3/		AB recipients per 1,000 population aged 18 and over 4/		Children of disabled wage earners receiving OASDI benefits per 1,000 population under 18 4/		GA recipients per 1,000 population under 65 5/	
		Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
United States...	--	4.1	--	88	--	1.8	--	5.6	--
South Carolina.....	1	6.6	10	124	9	2.3	12	1.3	39
Arkansas.....	2	8.4	6	179	3	2.9	4	1.0	42
Georgia.....	3	11.4	2	151	4	2.4	8	1.9	35
Louisiana.....	4	9.9	3	141	6	2.3	10	3.1	27
Kentucky.....	5	5.4	17	130	7	4.1	2	2.7	28
Texas.....	6	1.5	44	104	13	2.2	16	6/	--
Arizona.....	7	--	--	107	12	2.0	18	4.9	17
West Virginia.....	8	7.4	7	84	17	6.6	1	1.4	38
North Carolina.....	9	8.5	5	183	2	2.3	11	1.2	41
New Mexico.....	10	5.6	16	64	26	1.5	27	0.9	43
Mississippi.....	11	12.3	1	333	1	2.4	9	0.7	44
Alabama.....	12	7.2	8	81	19	2.9	3	7/	45
Alaska.....	13	--	--	91	15	0.4	50	4.3	21
Virginia.....	14	3.2	34	50	30	2.5	7	1.3	40
North Dakota.....	15	3.8	25	25	45	1.1	45	5.8	14
Pennsylvania.....	16	2.8	36	80	20	2.2	15	4.2	22
Vermont.....	17	4.2	23	42	33	2.3	13	6/	--
Missouri.....	18	6.5	11	146	5	1.9	19	3.5	25
Kansas.....	19	3.6	28	41	34	1.5	24	5.4	15
Tennessee.....	20	5.7	15	113	11	2.9	5	2.3	32
Oklahoma.....	21	8.6	4	119	10	2.2	14	6/	--
Delaware.....	43	1.8	41	90	16	1.4	29	6.4	12
California.....	44	1.8	40	126	8	1.2	39	6.8	10
Michigan.....	45	1.3	46	34	40	1.5	26	20.1	1
New Jersey.....	46	2.1	38	23	47	1.4	32	5.2	16
Illinois.....	47	3.9	24	43	32	1.3	36	12.0	5
Nevada.....	48	--	--	99	14	0.4	51	2.0	34
Connecticut.....	49	1.6	42	17	51	1.2	40	4.7	20

1/ States with similar percent or rate ranked alphabetically. Data on recipient rate in APTD, AB, and GA from Social Security Bulletin, June 1962, p. 42, table 9.
2/ 49 States.
3/ 47 States.
4/ 51 States.
5/ 45 States.
6/ Not available.
7/ Less than 0.05.

AFDC families with an incapacitated father would show a correspondingly low recipient rate of child beneficiaries in families of disabled wage earners and vice versa. The precise opposite is the case, however. Analysis of the data shows that 17 of the 21 States with a high proportion of incapacitated father cases in AFDC had a recipient rate of child beneficiaries in families of disabled wage earners in OASDI above the national rate in December 1961. In contrast, all seven States with the lowest proportion of AFDC families with an incapacitated father had a recipient rate of child beneficiaries in families of disabled wage earners below the national figure.[5]

There does appear to be an inverse relationship, however, between the extent of the general assistance program and the proportion of AFDC families with an incapacitated father. Eighteen of the 21 States with a high proportion of incapacitated father cases on AFDC had a general assistance recipient rate in December 1961 below the national figure, and for two data were not available. Eight of these 21 States occupied the eight lowest positions in the ranking of States by general assistance recipient rate. In comparison, three of the seven States with a low proportion of incapacitated father cases in AFDC showed a recipient rate in general assistance above the national figure and a fourth was only slightly below. Only one of the seven ranked low (34th) among the States in this regard.

It would appear from this analysis that in some States there may be many dependent families with children headed by a father whose incapacity may be of lesser severity or duration than is required to qualify for APTD or AB or for disability benefits under OASDI. Under AFDC, States establish their own definitions of physical or mental incapacity and are permitted wide latitude in this respect. The Handbook of Public Assistance Administration offers this interpretation as a guide to the States: "The determination (of incapacity) is based on the simple fact of the existence of incapacity and not upon its cause, degree, duration, or accompanying factors."[6]

The data suggest the desirability of an intensive analysis of incapacitated father cases in States where there are significant numbers of such cases in the AFDC caseload. They would appear to represent a potential for programs of physical restoration and retraining.

The 1961 data show that at best only a small proportion of the incapacitated fathers had been recently provided vocational education or rehabilitation services. Only 7 percent of all AFDC families were reported as having received vocational education or rehabilitation services from a private or public agency other than the public welfare agency during the 12 months preceding the report. And this figure embraces all members of

---

[5] It might be assumed that the combination of a high disability recipient rate in OASDI with a high proportion of handicapped fathers in AFDC results from families turning to public assistance during the 6-month period required for the disabled father to qualify for benefits under OASDI. The AFDC cases with an incapacitated father are in general of long duration, however. The median period since most recent opening is 2.4 years, a higher figure than that of 2.1 years for all AFDC families.

Large-scale supplementation of OASDI disability benefits through AFDC also seems to be ruled out as a major reason for this combination of high recipient rates. The 1961 characteristics report shows that 15,368 families in which the father was incapacitated were receiving OASDI benefits, but the type of benefit is not specified. Assuming that all were disability benefits, this would still represent less than 10 percent of all families with an incapacitated father in AFDC.

[6] For national data on the age, major impairments, and education of incapacitated fathers in AFDC families in late 1961, see Robert H. Mugge, "Aid to Families with Dependent Children: Initial Findings of the 1961 Report on the Characteristics of Recipients," Social Security Bulletin, March 1963, pp. 10-12.

the AFDC families, including children receiving crippled children's services.[7]

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

Certainly the 21 States with a fifth to two-fifths of their AFDC load attributed to the incapacity of the father should provide fertile ground for projects aimed at the physical restoration and retraining of incapacitated AFDC fathers. Much would be gained for these men and their families also through projects whose objective is to enable some of them to attain "personal independence." Restoration of incapacitated fathers to self-care would in many instances release other adults in AFDC families for outside employment. After all, the fact that almost 600,000 children are dependent because of the physical or mental incapacity of their fathers is sufficient reason for launching a "crash" program aimed at returning as many of these men as possible to self-support or self-care.

[7] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Institutions for Delinquent Children, 1963

About 38,500 children were living in public training schools for delinquent children on June 30, 1963, according to "Statistics on Public Institutions for Delinquent Children: 1963," a Children's Bureau report prepared by Duplain R. Gant. The public training school population decreased about 1 percent since 1962, although the number of institutions continued to increase and the child population aged 10-17 years increased by 4 percent. The slight decrease, the first recorded since the initiation of the reporting system in 1953, may reflect a growing trend toward expanded use of reception and diagnostic facilities, which at present are excluded in the reporting.

The average length of stay in public training schools was 9.5 months; the average stay was 9.2 months for boys and 10.9 months for girls.

One-fourth of the children committed during 1963 had been admitted previously. The institutions with populations of less than 150 continued to have the lowest returnee rate. Forty-four percent of the 230 institutions reporting had capacities of more than 150, the maximum generally recommended. Less than one-third of all public training schools were overcrowded in 1963. This is a decrease of 16 percent from 1962. A corresponding decrease in the child population in the smaller institutions (less than 200 population) influenced this decrease. However, almost all of the institutions with a capacity of 200-300 children and almost two-thirds of those with a capacity of 300 or more were overcrowded in 1963; as they were in 1962.

A little over three-fourths of the children in training schools were boys. This proportion has not changed since the data first became available in 1953.

An estimated $125 million was spent during fiscal year 1963 by public institutions for juvenile delinquents. The average annual per capita operating expenditure for caring for a child was $2,760. The cost for the average stay (9.5 months) in the institutions was $2,185.

Turnover in training school staff continues to be high--over one-fifth of all employees left their jobs in 1963. Two-thirds of them were treatment and educational personnel.

Legislation in the 88th Congress Concerning Welfare Administration Programs

CHARLES E. HAWKINS*

THE 88TH CONGRESS (1963-64) enacted a number of pieces of legislation directly affecting programs of the Welfare Administration. Six laws were passed which modified provisions of the Social Security Act relating to public assistance and maternal and child health. Parts of the Economic Opportunity Act and the appropriations act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to the operation of Welfare Administration programs under the Social Security Act. In addition, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 was extended for 2 years with new provisions added. The prohibition by the 1964 Civil Rights Act of discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in federally aided programs applied of course to all such programs administered by the Welfare Administration.

LAWS MODIFYING PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Of the six laws modifying the provisions of the Social Security Act that concern public assistance and maternal and child health, three made substantive changes and four extended provisions of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments which were scheduled to expire during 1964; one law included both an extension and a substantive change.

The most significant of these pieces of legislation was Public Law 88-156, the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963.[1] This law increased the authorized appropriations for maternal and child health services by $5-million steps from the previous level of $25 million per year to $50 million per year in 1971 and thereafter. Identical changes were made in the authorization for appropriations for crippled children's services. Research projects were authorized for evaluation and improvement of the programs of maternal and child health and crippled children's services. A new 5-year program of grants was authorized to provide health care to expectant mothers where the risk involved in pregnancy is high and the prospect of premature birth with the accompanying risk of mental retardation is great. This program was authorized $5 million for fiscal year 1964; $15 million for fiscal year 1965; and $30 million each for the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968.

This law also added Title XVII to the Social Security Act; this title authorized what were essentially one-time planning grants for States to assist in developing comprehensive plans for combating mental retardation.

Public Law 88-641, approved on October 13, 1964, included a Senate Finance Committee amendment introduced by Senator Ribicoff which permits States to continue with federally assisted payments under the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program for children

*Legislative Reference Officer, Welfare Administration.

[1] For full description and legislative history of these amendments, see November 1963 issue of Welfare in Review.

who have passed their 18th birthdays (but not their 21st) and who are still in high school or pursuing an equivalent course or a vocational or technical training course designed to equip them for employment. Under prior law Federal participation was not available in payments to a child who had passed his 18th birthday; thus many children still in high school became ineligible for aid. This public law also included a provision, originally passed by the House of Representatives, which extended the authorization for Federal participation in payments for foster care under the AFDC program for children in nonprofit, private, child-care institutions from September 30, 1964, to June 30, 1967.

Public Law 88-650, approved on October 13, 1964, while dealing primarily with the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, also included a Senate Finance Committee amendment proposed by Senator Hartke making it possible for States to exempt additional amounts of income and resources of persons receiving aid to the blind under Title X for up to 3 years as part of an approved rehabilitation plan. Under prior law States were required to provide such exemption for up to 1 year. The new law permits States, if they choose, to extend this period for an additional 2 years.

Public Laws 88-48 and 88-345 extended the expiration dates of a provision of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments authorizing Federal participation under certain conditions in payments for foster care of children under the AFDC program where the responsibility for placement and care is in a public agency other than the State public welfare agency. The extensions were from June 30, 1963, to June 30, 1964, and to June 30, 1967, respectively.

Public Law 88-347 extended the period during which temporary assistance may be provided to U.S. citizens returned from foreign countries from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1967.

The public laws extended all provisions of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments that were due to expire in 1964 to June 30, 1967. This is the same date on which a number of other provisions of the 1962 amendments are scheduled to expire. The Public Welfare Advisory Council, which is currently studying public assistance and child welfare programs, will have an opportunity to make its recommendations with respect to these provisions as well as others.

OTHER LEGISLATION AFFECTING WELFARE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Two titles of Public Law 88-542, the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964," are directly related to the operation of grant-in-aid programs under the Social Security Act. Title V, "Work Experience Programs," authorizes the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to transfer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare $150 million for projects administered under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act and designed to help unemployed fathers and other needy persons to secure and retain employment or attain and retain capability for self-support or personal independence. Section 1115 is the provision of the 1962 amendments which authorizes pilot, experimental, or demonstration projects which will promote the objectives of the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act and permits the waiver of plan requirements (however, under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act certain requirements applicable to community work and training projects under Title IV of the Social Security Act may not be waived).

Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act requires the exemption of the first $85 plus one-half of the remainder of payments made under Titles I or II of that Act in determining a person's need for public assistance under Titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act. Amounts not required to be exempted may be counted in determining the need of any other person only to the extent they are actually made available

to such persons. Loans made to a family under Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act may not be regarded as income or resources of the family in determining the need of any member of the family for public assistance. States not complying with the provisions of this title because of requirements of a State's statute will not have funds withheld prior to July 1, 1965.

The appropriation act providing funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, modifies the provisions of the Social Security Act in two respects. It requires that Federal funds used for day care services be matched with an equal amount of State or local funds for day care services after January 1, 1966. At present, day care services are considered a part of the total child welfare services program under Title V, Part 3, of the Social Security Act and do not require specific matching as long as the matching requirements for the program as a whole are met.

The appropriation act also forbade the use of funds under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act, which authorizes demonstration projects that will promote the objectives of the public assistance titles. However, Congress in the Supplemental Appropriation Act authorized funds under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act which could be expended under Section 1115 and made specific provision that up to $2 million of the Economic Opportunity Act funds can be used to carry on existing projects under Section 1115. The appropriation act also earmarks $3.5 million of the amount available for maternal and child health services for special projects for mentally retarded children and $2.5 million of the amount available for crippled children's services for special projects for crippled children who are mentally retarded.

EXTENSION OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT OF 1961

An important piece of legislation that became law in 1964 was an extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. The original act, which was scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964, was extended for 2 years with an authorization for appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1965. In addition, the law (Public Law 88-368) contained two new provisions. It authorized $5 million for a comprehensive demonstration project in the Washington, D.C., area and it directed that a study be made of child labor laws, compulsory school attendance, and their effects on juvenile delinquency.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Title VI of Public Law 88-352, the "Civil Rights Act of 1964," prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs. The requirements that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" of course applies to the public welfare programs and all other programs supported by the Welfare Administration.

Child-Rearing and Family Relationship Patterns of the Very Poor

CATHERINE S. CHILMAN*

POVERTY THAT CONTINUES from generation to generation is a problem of major concern today. This so-called cycle of poverty has many causes. Among them are certain cultural patterns--the ways in which parents in very poor families rear their children and relate to each other. One of the approaches to an expansion of social and economic opportunities for the very poor consists of a variety of action programs directed, at least in part, toward helping families adopt a life style which is more effective in coping with the demands of an increasingly urban, technical, and complex society.

The knowledge on which such programs must be based includes a delineation of significant cultural patterns of the poor in regard to child-rearing and family relationships--an area in which much investigation has already been carried out. These studies are summarized here and the findings compared with those of studies concerned with "ideal" patterns of child-rearing and family life. Finally, the numerous implications of this body of information for service programs and for further research are indicated.

LIMITATIONS OF PAST RESEARCH

The term "subcultures of poverty," is used in this paper rather than the more familiar term, "culture of poverty," because the very poor apparently subscribe at least partially to much of the middle-class culture while adapting it to their own more disadvantaged situation.[1] Also, it is likely that there are a number of subcultures of poverty based on regional, ethnic, religious, and racial variation within the United States, although most of the published studies have failed to concern themselves with considerations of this kind.

Furthermore, the subcultures of poverty, as discussed here, refer to the subcultures of the very poor, as distinct from those of the stable working class. Until recently, research on low-income culture patterns has tended to treat these two groups together. More gross discriminations have generally been made between middle-class and lower class families. The criteria must be precise to differentiate the working class, the employed poor, the unemployed poor, or the chronically dependent poor. It is highly probable that there are more differences between the very poor (the chronically unemployed or casual, unskilled labor groups) and the skilled labor groups than between the latter and the middle class.[2] It is also probable that, with the increasing prosperity and economic security of skilled labor, this group is becoming more and more middle class in orientation.

Studies of lower class culture that have been made so far tend to be lacking in methodological precision. Further attention needs to be paid to a more rigorous definition of the nature of the sample (for instance, size of sample, randomness of sampling, and characteristics of the sample--racial, regional, national, religious, age, sex, and a finer delineation of social class level).

---

*Division of Research, Welfare Administration. Condensed from a monograph soon to be published by the Division.

For references, see end of article.

Many studies have been based on interview and observation techniques, with insufficient consideration given to issues of reliability and observer bias. While valuable insights can be gained from such methods, there is a tendency to make global generalizations that lack adequate support.

Little use has been made of standardized tests. While such tests have their limitations, including middle-class cultural bias and questionable applicability for subjects who are illiterate, more explorations might be made in this area, including the use of appropriate projective test techniques.

The current interest in the cultural characteristics of various groups has sometimes led to a tendency to forget that individuals within a group do not necessarily have all the characteristics of the socioeconomic group to which they belong. Moreover, most individuals belong to a number of subcultural groups and quite probably draw attitudes and values from each of them.

It seems appropriate also to bear in mind that individual behavior is a product of multiple causation. Other factors include the individual's physical constitution, his particular life experience and current situation, and his level of intellectual functioning.

Some of the hazards of quick, simple generalizations have been sketched here. While studies to date regarding the subcultures of the poor are limited in number, scope, and method, it is not realistic to wait for all of the required evidence in order to present some of it. Nor is it realistic to defer action-oriented programs until research has pointed the way with clarity and precision. As a stimulant both to further study and to action programs, the following material is presented, with the recognition that many of the findings summarized here may be changed or modified with time and further research.

CHILD-REARING PATTERNS

While each family has its individual style of living, research findings indicate that certain child-rearing patterns tend

Table 1. Child-rearing patterns found to be characteristic of families of children who are educationally achieving compared with relevant patterns found to be characteristic of very poor families

Conducive (Refs. 3-8)	Low-income (Refs. 2,6,9-15)
1. Child given freedom within consistent limits to explore and experiment.	1. Limited freedom for exploration (partly imposed by crowded and dangerous aspects of environment).
2. Wide range of parent-guided experiences, offering visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile stimulation.	2. Constricted lives led by parents: fear and distrust of the unknown.
3. Goal-commitment and belief in long-range success potential.	3. Fatalistic, apathetic attitudes.
4. Gradual training for and value placed on independence.	4. Tendency for abrupt transition to independence: parents tend to "lose control" of children at early age.
5. Educational-occupational success of parents; model as continuing "learners" themselves.	5. Tendency to educational-occupational failure; reliance on personal versus skill attributes of vocational success.
6. Reliance on objective evidence.	6. Magical, rigid thinking.
7. Much verbal communication.	7. Little verbal communication.

to be more characteristic of lower class than of middle-class parents, as listed in tables 1-4. (In regard to these tables it should be noted that because a pattern has been found to be more characteristic of poor families than of more affluent ones, this pattern is not necessarily predominant in these families. It is also important to recognize that there is a growing body of research which strongly indicates that parental practices apparently have a differential effect on boys and on girls.)

The tables also summarize many of the major findings of a large number of studies of child-rearing practices that are found to be variously conducive to a child's emotional health; educational achievement; social success; and "good moral character," i.e., ability to resist temptation and to be responsible and honest.

When the relevant child-rearing patterns of the very poor are compared with those which are found to be con-

Table 2. Child-rearing patterns found to be characteristic of families of children who are emotionally healthy compared with relevant patterns found to be characteristic of very poor families

(Refs. 3-7, 9, 16-22)	(Refs. 2, 10-13, 15, 23, 25, 28-38)
1. Respect for child as individual whose behavior has multiple causes.	1. Misbehavior regarded as such in terms of concrete pragmatic outcomes; reasons for behavior not considered.
2. Commitment to slow development of child from infancy to maturity; stresses and pressures of each stage accepted by parent because of perceived worth of ultimate goal of rearing "happy," successful son or daughter.	2. Lack of goal commitment, impulsive gratification, fatalism, lack of belief in long-range success; main object for parent and child is "keep out of trouble."
3. Discipline chiefly verbal, mild, reasonable, consistent, based on needs of child, family, and society; more emphasis on rewarding good behavior than on punishing bad behavior.	3. Discipline harsh, inconsistent, physical, makes use of ridicule; based on whether child's behavior does or does not annoy parent.
4. Open, free, verbal communication between parent and child; control largely verbal.	4. Limited verbal communication; control largely physical.
5. Democratic rather than autocratic or laissez faire methods of rearing, with both parents in equalitarian but not necessarily interchangeable roles.	5. Authoritarian methods; mother chief child-care agent; father, when in home, mainly a punitive figure.
6. Parents view selves as generally competent adults.	6. Low parental self-esteem.
7. Intimate, expressive, warm relationship between parent and child, allowing for gradually increasing independence.	7. Large families; more impulsive, narcissistic parent behavior.
8. Presence of father in home.	8. Father out of home.
9. Free verbal communication about sex, acceptance of child's sex needs, channeling of sex drive through "healthy" psychological defenses, acceptance of slow growth toward impulse control and sex satisfaction in marriage; sex education by both father and mother.	9. Repressive, punitive attitude about sex, sex questioning, and experimentation. Sex viewed as exploitative relationship.
10. Acceptance of child's drive for aggression but channeling it into socially approved outlets.	10. Alternating encouragement and restriction of aggression, primarily related to consequences of aggression for parents.

ducive to educational achievement, the contrast is striking (table 1). While it would be premature and overly simple to conclude that disadvantaged families tend to rear their children for failure in school, evidence accumulated to date points in this direction.

Similarly, the opportunity for very poor children to grow up as emotionally healthy individuals would seem to be seriously jeopardized if their parents employ the child-rearing patterns which research indicates to be more typical of low-income families than of middle-class ones (table 2). Very poor parents would also seem to have a tendency to rear their children in ways that tend to be prejudicial to their social acceptability in the usual middle-class group, as indicated in table 3.

The higher rates of delinquency and rejection by authority figures of the children of the very poor are probably related in part to the child-rearing methods used by their parents. Such character traits as honesty, responsibility, dependability, resistance to temptation, and capacity for impulse control would seem to be consonant with adherence to many of the legal requirements set up by our society. These traits also are favored by such success-relevant figures as school authorities and employers. While evidence from research is rather fragmentary in the area of parental practices which are conducive to producing this "good moral character," that which is available strongly suggests that the children of the very poor have less chance to develop socially desirable character traits than children of other socioeconomic groups (table 4).

While the tables tend to oversimplify the evidence and thus may lead to unwarranted generalizations, they do indicate that lower-class parents tend far more than middle-class ones to bring up their children in ways that are conducive to serious difficulties in the four crucial areas examined. The phenomenon of generation-to-generation poverty may well be associated in part with such parental methods, behavior, and attitudes.

Although it is recognized that, in effect, the dice are loaded against very poor parents in the presentation of evidence such as this, our predominantly middle-class society is also inherently and inevitably loaded against them. Criteria of emotional health, social acceptability, and "good moral character" are all middle-class concepts. Research in these areas is generally built on such criteria. Therefore, it is inevitable that lower class children more often than middle-class ones would fail to meet the standards on which most studies are based. Moreover, schools are basically middle-class institutions; again it is no wonder that lower class children have trouble achieving in such settings.

Table 3. Child-rearing patterns found to be characteristic of families of children who are socially successful compared with relevant patterns found to be characteristic of very poor families

Conducive (Refs. 6,7)	Low-income (Refs. 2, 13, 27, 32, 39)
1. Social skills in dress, manners, speech, games, etc., according to middle-class norms.	1. Little skill in prevalent middle-class behavior.
2. Sensitivity to feelings and attitudes of others.	2. Slight awareness of subtleties of interpersonal relations.
3. Ability to be flexible and conform to group.	3. Tendency to be rigid and non-conforming to middle-class norms.
4. Good impulse control.	4. Poor impulse control.
5. Cheerful, happy, self-assured attitude.	5. Low self-esteem, distrust, tendency to hostile aggression and/or withdrawal.

Table 4. Child-rearing patterns found to be characteristic of families of children who are of "good character"* compared with relevant patterns found to be characteristic of very poor families

Conducive (Ref. 40)	Low-income (Refs. 2, 10, 13, 15, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 35)
1. Democratic child-rearing methods.	1. Authoritarian methods.
2. Mild, reasonable, consistent discipline.	2. Harsh, physical, inconsistent discipline.
3. Child's capacity for moral judgment, according to basic principles, is viewed as a slowly developing ability.	3. Reasons for child's misbehavior tend not to be considered; specific behavioral outcomes rather than principles considered paramount.
4. Moral values are discussed and clarified.	4. Little verbal communication and discussion.
5. Parents set example by their own behavior.	5. Parental behavior more apt to be impulsive and gratification-oriented.

*Defined as including honesty, responsibility, dependability, and ability to resist temptation.

But this "lack of fit" cannot be tossed aside because it can be explained. The middle-class culture has in part produced our prosperous, technically advanced society; it has also in part been produced by these technical advances. There is a cycle of prosperity, just as there is a cycle of poverty. The individual or family that wishes to participate in the first cycle very probably must abandon the second. For instance, fatalism, apathy, impulsiveness, and lack of goal-commitment ill-serve the person who wants to escape from the urban gray areas into the suburban green ones.

It is also recognized that research findings are dependent on what questions are asked. The weakness of child-rearing methods used by the poor may well be overemphasized in this report partly because of what research personnel have looked for--their hypotheses and related questions.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIP PATTERNS

Table 5 summarizes the research evidence on attitudes and behavior found to be more characteristic of low-income families as a group than of middle-class ones as a group which concern interpersonal relations between the sexes. It also summarizes the findings that show a strong association with "good" marital adjustment.

While the summary of findings presented in table 5, like those in the preceding tables, may lead to oversimplification and easy generalizations, it shows that the attitudes and behavior of the very poor tend, more than those of the middle class, to be antithetical to a stable, personally fulfilling marriage. (Although the matter of "personal fulfillment" in marriage is a highly subjective one, the research leading to the findings in table 5 includes a number of studies, done at various times with various populations. Self-ratings as to marital happiness have been most generally used as criteria of personal fulfillment since there is doubt as to whether better criteria exist. Other criteria have also been used, such as lack of separation, desertion, and divorce.) Such attitudes and behavior probably play an important part in the far higher rate of family instability--separation, divorce, desertion, illegitimacy--found among the very poor. Since a stable, "happy" marital adjustment of the parents is important to the psychological, social, and educational well-being of the child, not only during childhood but also as he grows up and establishes his own family, the implications of the tendencies of the very poor toward destructive hetero-

sexual attitudes and behavior are serious indeed. As in the case of child-rearing patterns, it is apparent that the interparental life style of this group is more likely to play into the continuing cycle of generation-to-generation disadvantages of the "hard-core" poor than is the interparental life style of the middle class. However, as with the findings on child-rearing patterns, it should be noted that concepts of marital happiness and stability are middle-class in nature and that research findings derive in large part from the questions that are asked.

ASSOCIATED OUTCOMES

Some of the major expected outcomes of the child-rearing patterns and family life styles of low-income parents have already been highlighted. The subcultures

Table 5. Attitudes and behavior found to be prevalent among low-income men and women compared with attitudes and behavior strongly associated with "good" marital adjustment*

Good marital adjustment (Refs. 34, 41-51)	Low-income behavior and attitudes (Refs. 2, 10, 23-26, 28, 34, 51-54)
1. Happiness of parents' marriage and lack of divorce in family of origin.	1. High divorce and separation rates of the very poor.
2. High level of self-perceived childhood happiness.	2. Research evidence lacking; professional observation suggests higher levels of childhood unhappiness among very poor.
3. Mild but firm discipline during childhood with only moderate punishment.	3. Severe, harsh, inconsistent punishment in childhood.
4. Adequate sex information, especially from encouraging parents.	4. Repressive, punitive attitudes toward sex.
5. Substantial time of acquaintance and engagement before marriage.	5. Short courtship, marriage often because of pregnancy.
6. Marriage in the middle 20's or older.	6. Teen-age marriages common.
7. Mutual enjoyment of sex relations.	7. Sex regarded as enjoyable only for male, women regarding it as source of economic security; basically exploitative on both sides.
8. Open expression of affection between sexes, confidence in each other, equalitarian, free communication.	8. Little expressed affection, male in dominant role, women aligned against men, little communication, attitudes of mutual exploitation.
9. Joint participation in outside interests, friends in common.	9. Masculine and feminine worlds separate, few friends.
10. Residence stable, in single home.	10. Residence in multiple dwellings, frequent moving.
11. Education at least through high school.	11. Education less than high school.
12. High socioeconomic level, income at least $5,000 per year.	12. Low socioeconomic level, income less than $3,000 per year.

*Insofar as studies have been done concerning differences between Negroes and whites, findings indicate apparent differences largely disappear when data are carefully analyzed in terms of strictly comparable socioeconomic levels. Thus studies reporting racial differences are likely to be reporting class differences.

of poverty, in comparison with other cultural patterns, would seem to be more conducive not only to poor emotional health, school failure, social rejection, inadequate impulse control (lack of "good" character), and family breakdown but also to collateral areas of behavioral malfunctioning. These include difficulties in obtaining and holding a job, in effective participation in the various social systems of the community, in adequate home-management and consumer skills, and in political participation as a citizen in a democracy.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE

The cultural patterns that have been outlined present numerous implications for development of services for families living in poverty. A few of these implications are:

1. Since the conditions of poverty are likely to promote the subcultures of poverty, it is obvious that such conditions as insufficient income, lack of equal opportunities, poor housing, inadequate schools, exploitation, etc., must be ameliorated in order to produce a milieu in which new behavior patterns can develop and flourish.

2. Since the subcultures of poverty tend to be defeating to the poor, it seems that remedial efforts planned with and for the poor should provide ways in which some of these culture patterns can be modified. While it is generally inappropriate to impose middle-class ways on the disadvantaged, it may well be appropriate to develop plans and services with them that may lead to the achievement of certain middle-class attitudes and behavior, since these attitudes and behavior are more likely to bring about the social and economic rewards generally associated with middle-class membership to which many of the poor aspire.

3. Perhaps the subcultures of poverty could be tentatively diagnosed as being (at least, in the American middle-class value orientation) a comparatively immature system of behavior and attitudes since, in the light of available research, some of their outstanding features are magical thinking, subjective judgment, impulse gratification, use of force rather than reason, alienation from authority figures, lack of goal commitment, distrust of heterosexual relationships, projection of problems on to others, and other similar characteristics.

If it is agreed that these characteristics are more typically associated with childhood and youth than with adult maturity in the middle-class American culture,[55] does it follow that many of the poor need, in effect, to be guided with the same kind of mild, firm, consistent discipline that research reveals to be so closely associated with positive mental health, educational achievement, "good moral character," and eventual marital success? Such guidance would require modification, of course, in its use with adults.

4. Since a pragmatic, concrete, personal, physical learning style appears to be characteristic of most low-income persons, how can services be designed that will work with, rather than in opposition to, such a style? Clues from a variety of sources indicate that a direct, assertive, specific approach is more effective in group and individual counseling than the more subtle, abstract, insight-oriented approach often used with middle-class clients.[56] Role-playing and other "learning-by-doing" projects seem to be more effective than strictly verbal approaches to problem-solving.[57]

Considerable experimentation is going on at present in reference to specific structuring of the external environment and direct teaching of individuals to play certain roles in this environment rather than relying on internal personality changes developed from verbalized insights and a therapeutic relationship. By acting differently in a structured situation, some people, at least, seem to begin to feel and think differently.[58]

5. The possible benefits to be gained from cultural enrichment of disadvantaged preschool children presents a direct chal-

lenge. Experimentation and research in ways of overcoming the cultural deficits of poor children at the the preschool level are being financed by various programs in the Welfare Administration, as well as by other Federal programs and by foundations.

Experimentation that includes opportunities in cultural enrichment for older children, youth, and adults is going forward in a number of communities.[59] Such experimentation will doubtlessly increase under the job-training, educational programs, and community development features of the Economic Opportunity Act.

6. Day care centers and homemaker services not only offer needed direct services to many low-income families but also help parents and children learn new cultural patterns and skills by observation and participation.

7. Further training of public welfare staff members in reference to the subcultures of poverty and their implications seems relevant. Such training might be carried forward by a variety of formal and informal arrangements, including inservice training.

In line with its policy of seeking to develop more effective treatment as well as research and demonstration programs, the Welfare Administration through the Office of the Commissioner, the Children's Bureau, and the Bureau of Family Services recently participated in a 3-day national group consultation on parent and family life education. This consultation was planned by the Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth and brought together specialized consultants from many professions and from public and voluntary agencies and universities. (Other participating Federal agencies were the Public Health Service, Department of Agriculture, Office of Education, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Department of Labor, and Selective Services of the Department of Defense.) A Federal publication providing guides to services and research in parent education with low-income families will be one of the results of this consultation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Descriptive Research

At the descriptive level, it is clear that more precise and rigorous studies are required in order to obtain more exact information about the various ethnic, regional, racial, and religious subcultures of poverty. A refinement of techniques is called for, with:

1. Careful attention paid to random sampling from a defined population.
2. Adequate sample size and description of sample.
3. Development of testing instruments with due consideration given to their applicability to the research questions of the study and to their reliability and validity.
4. Analysis of data through the use of appropriate statistical methods.
5. Comparison of samples from several defined populations (for example, lower-lower class compared with (a) working class and (b) middle class).

Also, at the descriptive level, it is important to know more about the characteristics of groups of individuals who manage to escape from poverty. If the child-rearing and family life patterns of the very poor do tend to block the chances of the individual to move upward, how do the poor who are upwardly mobile differ from those who are not in reference to the values, attitudes, and practices of their parents and in reference to their own present cultural characteristics? Studies along these lines are in progress, underwritten by Welfare Administration funds.

Since there are usually large differences between the sexes in reference to personality characteristics, interests, aspirations, and values, descriptive studies aimed at differentiating the successful from the nonsuccessful "slum child" should be designed with questions directed towards male and female groups considered separately.

Experimental Research

There is a strong need for action re-

search aimed at finding out whether specific treatment programs actually "make a difference." While descriptive studies have their important place in yielding more sophisticated insights and suggesting programs for change, the crucial question is whether these insights and suggestions add up to effective programs. Whether or not such programs actually represent an improvement must be objectively tested, insofar as this is possible.

For example, in a preceding section suggestions were made for various ways of devising services for very poor families which might lead to more effective child-rearing practices and family life style. Programs designed along such lines should be subjected to carefully designed evaluation techniques. Part of this evaluation needs to be focused on behavioral outcomes that can be objectively measured.

Evaluation too frequently is focused on attempts to measure such factors as changes in attitudes and information. One of the outstanding deficiencies of measurements of this kind is that there is no guarantee that changed attitudes and information lead to changed behavior.

For instance, if, as a result of a parent discussion group, parents say that harsh, physical, dictatorial punishment has a bad effect on children, does this mean that they actually abstain from this kind of punishment and substitute in its place mild, consistent, reasoned discipline? To push this point one step further, if parents do manage to behave differently in reference to discipline, does their children's behavior show an objectively observable difference? Theoretically, such a parental change should lead to a reduction in a child's overt aggression in the home, school, and community. Do such changes occur and are they maintained over time?

Long-range behavioral outcomes associated with service programs designed for the very poor include: improved school attendance and academic success, obtaining and holding employment, better handling of family income, improved housekeeping, better physical health, reduction in deviant behavior, and increase in marital stability.

If goals such as these are reached, which individuals reach them and under what program methodologies and content? For which individuals does the program seem to be a failure? What are their characteristics? We can learn just as much from reported failures as we can from reported successes, although the tendency seems to be to publish reports only of the successes. Does the group served by a program change to a greater extent than a group not served? If behavioral changes are found to occur, do they persist over time?

Experimental programs with an evaluation component need to be repeated with different groups of subjects, with different staff composition, and in different parts of the country in order to find out whether or not the service methodology has general application.

Technical difficulties are present in research of this kind. Measurement of change is one of these difficulties. The Division of Research of the Welfare Administration is currently engaged in an attempt to devise a method of measuring family change that can be used by research personnel as one evaluation method in a number of experimental projects.

Some very difficult research and evaluation questions have been raised here. Finding at least some of the answers will not only add to scientific knowledge and give clues to further research but also contribute to the development of public welfare practice aimed at family and individual rehabilitation and the reduction of economic dependency.

References

1. Irelan, Lola M.: "Escape from the Slums: A Focus for Research," Welfare in Review, vol. 2, no. 12, December 1964, pp. 19-23.

2. Herzog, Elizabeth: "Some Assumptions About the Poor," Social Service Review, vol. 37, no. 4, December 1963, pp. 389-402.

3. Brackbill, Y., and D. Jack: "Discrimination Learning in Children as a Function of

Reenforcement Value," Child Development, vol. 29, 1959, pp. 185-190.

4. Crandall, W. J., Anne Preston, and Alice Robson: "Maternal Reactions and the Development of Independence and Achievement Behavior in Young Children," Child Development, vol. 31, pp. 243-251, 1960, p. 20.

5. Ackerman, Nathan, et al.: "Child and Family Psychopathy: Problems of Correlation," in P. H. Hoch and J. Juzer, eds.: Psychopathology of Childhood. Grune and Stratton, New York, 1955.

6. Jersild, Arthur: Child Psychology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1954, pp. 235-249.

7. Watson, Robert: Psychology of the Child. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1959, pp. 539-547.

8. Siegel, Irving E.: "The Attainment of Concepts," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds.: Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 1. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1964.

9. Yarrow, Leon J.: "Separation from Parents During Early Childhood," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds.: Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 1. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1964.

10. Lewis, Oscar: The Children of Sanchez. Random House, New York, 1961, p. xxiv.

11. Riessman, Frank: The Culturally Deprived Child. Harper and Bros., New York, 1962.

12. Davis, A., and R. J. Havighurst: "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," American Sociological Review, vol. 1, 1946, pp. 698-710.

13. Sewell, William H.: "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 349, September 1963, pp. 163-181.

14. Bernstein, Basil: "Social Class and Linguistic Development, A Theory of Social Learning," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Flowd, and C. Arnold Anderson, eds.: Education, Economy and Society. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1961.

15. Hunt, J. McV.: "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 64, January 1959, pp. 337-351.

16. Mussen, Paul H., and Luther Distler: "Masculinity, Identity, and Father-Son Relationships," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, vol. 59, November 1959; and "Consequences of Masculine Sex Typing in Adolescent Boys," Psychological Monographs, vol. 75, 1961.

17. Lynn, David B., and William L. Saurey: "The Effects of Father Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 59, September 1959, pp. 258-262.

18. Stolz, L. M., et al.: Father Relations of War-Born Children. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif., 1954.

19. Bach, G. R.: "Father Fantasies and Father Typing in Father Separated Children," Child Development, vol. 17, 1946, pp. 63-80.

20. Glidewell, Thomas, et al.: Parent Attitudes and Child Behavior. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1961.

21. Bronfenbrenner, Urie: "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," in E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, eds.: Readings in Social Psychology. Holt, New York, 1961.

22. Baldwin, A. L., J. Kalhorn, and F. H. Breese: "Patterns of Parent Behavior," Psychological Monographs, vol. 48, no. 3, 1945.

23. Meyers, Jerome I. and Bertram H. Roberts: Family and Class Dynamics in Mental Health. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1959.

24. Miller, Walter B.: "Implications of Urban Lower-Class Culture for Social Work," Social Service Review, vol. 32, September 1959, pp. 219-236.

25. Lewis, Hylan: Child-Rearing Practices Among Low Income Families in the District of Columbia. Presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, May 16, 1961, Minneapolis, Minn. Health and Welfare Council of the National Capitol Area, Washington, D.C., 1961. Mimeographed.

26. Vincent, Clark: Unmarried Mothers. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1961.

27. Bandura, A., and R. H. Walters: Adolescent Aggression. Ronald Press, New York, 1959.

28. Kohn, Melvin L.: "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority," American Sociological Review, vol. 24, June 1959.

29. Miller, S. M., and Frank Riessman: "The Working Class Subculture: A New View," Social Problems, vol. 9, summer 1961, pp. 86-97.

30. Kohn, Melvin L.: "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 64, January 1959, pp. 337-351.

31. Rodman, Hyman: "On Understanding Lower-Class Behavior," Social and Economic Studies, vol. 7, December 1959, pp. 441-450.

32. Caldwell, Bettye M.: "The Effects of Infant Care," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds.: Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 1. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1964.

33. Klatskin, E. H.: "Shift in Child Care Practices Under an Infant Care Program of Flexible Methodology," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, vol. 22, 1952, pp. 52-61.

34. Maccoby, E. E., and P. K. Gibbs: "Methods of Child-Rearing in Two Social Classes," in W. E. Martin and C. B. Stendler, eds.: Readings in Child Development. Harcourt Brace, New York, 1954. pp. 380-396.

35. White, M. S.: "Social Class, Child-Rearing Practices, and Child Behavior," Amer-

ican Sociological Review, vol. 22, 1957, pp. 704-712.

36. Kohn, M. L., and E. E. Carroll: "Social Class and the Allocation of Parental Responsibilities," Sociometry, vol. 23, 1960, pp. 372-392.

37. Bayley, N., and E. S. Shaefer: "Relationships Between Socioeconomic Variables and the Behavior of Mothers Toward Young Children," J. Genet. Psychol., vol. 96, 1960, pp. 61-77.

38. Wortis, H., et al.: "Child-Rearing Practices in a Low Socioeconomic Group," Pediatrics, vol. 32, 1963, pp. 298-307.

39. Sears, Robert, Eleanor Maccoby, and Harry Levin: Patterns of Child-Rearing. Row, Peterson and Co., Evanston, Ill., and White Plains, N.Y., 1957.

40. Kohlberg, Lawrence: "Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology," in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds: Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 1. Russell Sage Foundation, New York 1964.

41. Kirkpatrick, Clifford: The Family as Process and Institution. The Ronald Press, New York, 1963, pp. 375-407.

42. Burgess, Ernest W., and Leonard S. Cottrell: Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1939, pp. 58-74.

43. Terman, L. M.: Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1938, pp. 48-83.

44. Locke, Harvey J.: Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of a Divorced and a Happily Married Group. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1951.

45. Stroup, Atlee L.: "Predicting Marital Success or Failure in an Urban Population," American Sociological Review, vol. 28, 1953, p. 560.

46. King, Charles E.: "The Burgess-Cottrell Method of Measuring Marital Adjustment Applied to a Non-White Southern Urban Population," Marriage and Family Living, vol. 14, 1952, p. 284.

47. Locke, Harvey J., and Karl M. Wallace: "Short Marital-Adjustment and Prediction Tests: Their Reliability and Validity," Marriage and Family Living, vol. 21, 1959, pp. 251-255.

48. Bowerman, Charles: "Adjustment in Marriage: Over-All and in Specific Areas," Sociology and Social Research, vol. 41, 1957, pp. 257-263.

49. Locke, Harvey J., and Robert C. Williamson: "Marital Adjustment: A Factor Analysis Study," American Sociological Review, vol. 23, 1958, pp. 562-569.

50. Nye, F. Ivan, and Evelyn MacDougall: "The Dependent Variable in Marital Research," Pacific Sociological Review, vol. 2, 1959, pp. 67-70.

51. U.S. Bureau of the Census: "Marital Status, Economic Status, and Family Status: March 1957," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 81, March 19, 1958, p. 10.

52. Rohrer, John H., and Munro S. Edmondson: The Eighth Generation. Harper and Bros., New York, 1960.

53. Rainwater, Lee, and Karol Kane Weinstein: And the Poor Get Children. Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1960.

54. Handel, Gerald, and Lee Rainwater: "Working-Class People and Family Planning," Social Work, vol. 6, no. 2, April 1961.

55. Young, Leontine: Wednesday's Children. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964.

56. Weinandy, Janet: "Casework with Multi-Problem Families," Journal of Marriage and the Family, November 1964.

57. Riessman, Frank: "New Approaches to Mental Health Treatment for Labor and Low Income Groups," Mental Health Report No. 2. National Institute for Labor Education, 250 West 57th St., New York 19, N.Y. 1964.

58. Riessman, Frank: The Revolution in Social Work: The New Non-Professional. Training Department, Mobilization for Youth and Urban Study Center, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., October 1962. Mimeographed.

59. Chilman, Catherine, and Ivor Kraft: "Helping Low Income Parents Through Parent Education Groups," Children, July-August 1963, pp. 127-132.

Publications of Interest*

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

HOMEMAKERS: A NATIONAL NEED. By Ellen Winston. Welfare Administration, 1964. 12 pp. Reprint of a paper delivered at the National Conference on Homemaker Services in Washington on April 29, 1964. A brief discussion of the need for homemakers, the current growth of service, the several kinds of Federal aid available for homemaker services, relation to day care programs, and economic aspects.

SELECTED SOCIAL WORK CONCEPTS FOR PUBLIC WELFARE WORKERS. By Virginia L. Tannar. Bureau of Family Services, 1964. 150 pp. 45 cents. Intended to be a resource for those who teach public welfare workers. Besides presenting the basic principles of social work, the book suggests teaching methods designed to help agency workers advance toward more competent practice.

A GUIDE FOR TRAINING LOCAL PUBLIC WELFARE ADMINISTRATORS. By Joseph I. Hungate, Jr. Bureau of Family Services, 1964. 136 pp. 45 cents. Intended primarily as a training text to be used by staff development personnel of State and local public welfare agencies in training administrators.

GUIDES TO IMPROVING THE CASEWORKER'S MANUAL. By John Bowes. Organization and Management in Public Assistance series. Bureau of Family Services, 1964. 31 pp. How to improve the manual so that it will be current and reliable.

CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER PERSONS: Selected Papers From the Fourth Annual Conference of State Executives on Aging. OA No. 122. Office of Aging, 1964. 44 pp. 30 cents. Six major papers of conference held April 27-29, 1964, in Washington.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION AFFECTING OLDER PERSONS: 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION. Highlights of Legislation on Aging series. OA No. 514. Office of Aging, December 1964. 7 pp.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU. Children's Bureau, 1964. 33 pp. Latest listing of current publications of the Bureau.

REPORT ON DAY CARE: Meeting of Representatives of State Advisory Committees on Day Care Services and State Departments of Public Welfare, March 19, 20, 1964. Child Welfare Report No. 14. Children's Bureau, 1964. 54 pp.

THE 16TH YEAR OF WORK: INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH. Annual Report, July 1, 1963-June 30, 1964. Children's Bureau, 1964. 85 pp.

AGENCY OPERATED GROUP HOMES: A SPECIALIZED RESOURCE FOR SERVING CHILDREN AND YOUTH. By Martin Gula. Children's Bureau Publication 416. 1964. 35 pp. 20 cents. Pulls together what is known about group homes owned or rented by social agencies. Intended for citizens, administrators, and others interested in the possibilities of group homes for children.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SERVICES. Children's Bureau Publication 421. 1964. 48 pp. 25 cents. Describes the services that should be available in the community to control juvenile delinquency and treat the young persons involved.

DELINQUENT CHILDREN IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS. By William H. Sheridan and Alice B. Freer. Children's Bureau Publication 415. 1964. 33 pp. 20 cents. Discusses direct commitment of youth to penal institutions by juvenile courts and transfer of youth to penal institutions from training schools without court process--the extent of these practices, policy questions, and recommended legislation.

TRENDS IN INFANT AND CHILDHOOD MORTALITY, 1961. Children's Bureau Statistical Series 76. 1964. 72 pp.

DAY CARE FOR YOUR CHILD IN A FAMILY HOME. Children's Bureau Publication 411. 1964. 14 pp. 15 cents. Written especially for the mother who does not have the help of a social agency in locating family day care for her child.

DAY CARE FOR OTHER PEOPLE'S CHILDREN IN YOUR HOME. Children's Bureau Publication 412. 1964. 17 pp. 15 cents. Intended to help women without access to a social agency give the best possible care to the children they take into their home.

THE CHILD WITH A SPEECH PROBLEM. Children's Bureau Folder 52. 1964. 24 pp. 15 cents. Suggestions to parents on how to help children with speech problems.

YOUR PRESCHOOL CHILD'S EYES. Children's Bureau Folder 54. 1964. 15 pp. 15 cents. Urges parents to have their children's eyes checked and describes signs of possible visual problems.

---

*U.S. Government publications for which prices are listed may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (25 percent discount on lots of 100 or more). Inquiries or orders for other publications should be directed to the publisher or issuing agency.

Program and Operating Statistics

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE IN OCTOBER 1964

More than 7.8 million persons received aid under the six public assistance programs[1] in October--an increase of about 21,000 from the number in September. The net rise--the second in the past 7 months--was attributable mainly to the increases in number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children (17,200 or 0.4 percent) and of medical assistance for the aged (12,400 or 6.0 percent). In AFDC, although 30 States reported increases, 14,500 of the national increase was centered in California's program. For the 18 States that extend aid to children of unemployed parents, however, the number of recipients under this part of the program decreased by 7,700.

From September to October, the number of persons assisted in aid to the permanently and totally disabled rose 4,100 or 0.8 percent. There was a decline of 10,900 or 1.5 percent in the number of recipients of general assistance (the eighth decrease since last January) and the relatively slight decreases continued in old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

Total payments for assistance, including vendor payments for medical care, were $434.1 million in October--$10.4 million more than in September. Most of the national increase resulted from increases in vendor payments for medical care in Pennsylvania ($3.7 million) and in New York ($3.0 million). Higher money payments for AFDC in all States combined, including a rise of $0.6 million in California, accounted for $1.1 million of the national increase in total payments.

State action to adjust payments, as in other recent months, was limited. Connecticut restored allowances for fuel for heating in the unemployed-parent segment of AFDC. In Massachusetts, payment rates were raised for visiting nurses, and, in medical assistance for the aged, the State liberalized exemptions applying to income and personal property.

The Virgin Islands raised the food allowances in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and AFDC; increases in average money payments per recipient ranged from 69 cents in AFDC to $7 in aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

---

[1] Data for specified types of assistance under State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged are classified with data for separate State programs for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or medical assistance for the aged.

Table 1. Number of recipients of public assistance in the United States, by month, October 1963-October 1964 1/

[Except for general assistance, includes cases receiving only vendor payments for medical care]

Year and month	Old-age assistance 2/	Medical assistance for the aged 2/	Aid to the blind 2/	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled 2/	Aid to families with dependent children			General assistance 4/	
					Families	Total recipients 3/	Children	Cases	Recipients
	Number of recipients								
1963									
October....	2,196,430	157,038	98,177	475,490	953,930	3,908,819	2,936,723	326,000	766,000
November...	2,194,387	152,872	97,843	477,464	955,343	3,921,560	2,946,317	322,000	764,000
December...	2,193,581	149,880	97,793	479,312	966,779	3,980,667	2,987,197	352,000	872,000
1964									
January....	2,190,006	156,788	97,709	482,432	983,071	4,060,209	3,042,643	376,000	951,000
February...	2,188,506	160,471	97,617	486,286	999,970	4,141,730	3,098,336	374,000	933,000
March.....	2,188,610	172,736	97,760	490,156	1,013,313	4,206,817	3,148,698	374,000	914,000
April.....	2,186,711	176,416	97,631	493,974	1,023,504	4,261,988	3,188,192	360,000	845,000
May.....	2,185,137	181,056	97,582	497,451	1,021,647	4,253,591	3,183,965	335,000	746,000
June.....	2,181,957	187,141	97,409	501,429	1,014,139	4,214,901	3,159,474	325,000	707,000
July.....	2,177,085	185,641	97,259	508,902	1,009,211	4,191,264	3,142,843	321,000	700,000
August.....	2,167,687	207,383	97,064	511,565	1,006,106	4,176,778	3,133,162	323,000	712,000
September..	2,162,397	208,354	96,852	514,942	1,001,470	4,157,571	3,121,838	321,000	702,000
October....	2,160,943	220,783	96,586	519,057	1,005,880	4,174,728	3,138,039	319,000	691,000
	Percentage change from previous month								
1963									
October....	+0.2	+9.5	+0.2	+0.7	+0.2	+0.2	+0.2	+1.5	+1.6
November...	-.1	-2.7	-.3	+.4	+.1	+.3	+.3	-1.5	-.2
December...	(5/)	-2.0	-.1	+.4	+1.2	+1.5	+1.4	+9.6	+14.1
1964									
January....	-.2	+4.6	-.1	+.6	+1.7	+2.0	+1.9	+6.6	+9.1
February...	-.1	+2.3	-.1	+.8	+1.7	+2.0	+1.8	-.6	-1.9
March.....	(6/)	+7.6	+.1	+.8	+1.3	+1.6	+1.6	(5/)	-2.1
April.....	-.1	+2.1	-.1	+.8	+1.0	+1.3	+1.3	-3.7	-7.6
May.....	-.1	+2.6	-.1	+.7	-.2	(5/)	-.1	-6.9	-11.6
June.....	-.1	+3.4	-.2	+.8	-.7	-.9	-.8	-3.1	-5.3
July.....	-.2	-.8	-.2	+1.5	-.5	-.6	-.5	-1.2	-1.0
August.....	-.4	+11.7	-.2	+.5	-.3	-.3	-.3	+.6	+1.7
September..	-.2	+.5	-.2	+.7	-.5	-.5	-.4	-.7	-1.4
October....	-.1	+6.0	-.3	+.8	+.4	+.4	+.5	-.7	-1.5

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Represents data for recipients of the specified type of assistance under separate State programs and under State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 3/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 4/ Partly estimated. Excludes Idaho and Indiana for all months and Nebraska beginning November 1963; data not available. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 2. Amount of public assistance payments in the United States, by month, October 1963-October 1964 1/

[Except for general assistance, includes vendor payments for medical care]

Year and month	Total 2/	Old-age assistance 3/	Medical assistance for the aged 3/	Aid to the blind 3/	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled 3/	Aid to families with dependent children	General assistance 4/
	Amount of assistance						
1963							
October	$399,682,000	$169,526,267	$31,851,812	$8,109,029	$36,287,197	$123,436,945	$21,742,000
November	393,517,000	168,016,542	28,965,741	7,990,500	35,943,652	122,803,458	21,209,000
December	402,511,000	168,983,570	30,212,494	8,021,573	36,301,752	126,646,605	23,951,000
1964							
January	407,261,000	168,976,922	30,929,251	8,013,048	36,599,229	128,916,121	25,665,000
February	414,664,000	171,345,730	31,757,790	8,076,895	37,336,550	132,718,951	24,988,000
March	424,754,000	172,520,773	34,679,610	8,140,935	38,241,308	136,836,208	25,155,000
April	427,748,000	171,440,998	36,532,021	8,167,521	38,683,146	139,562,947	24,063,000
May	422,742,000	171,192,802	35,219,429	8,200,759	38,975,943	138,444,208	21,830,000
June	422,689,000	171,148,145	36,836,751	8,190,942	39,359,870	137,029,371	20,985,000
July	423,375,000	171,666,945	36,264,602	8,218,116	40,135,587	137,361,814	21,082,000
August	422,206,000	168,197,446	39,228,542	8,198,173	39,874,445	136,270,573	20,925,000
September	423,675,000	168,530,628	38,264,547	8,179,617	40,476,692	137,659,015	21,237,000
October	434,064,000	170,461,400	43,739,320	8,237,410	41,281,977	139,484,356	21,674,000
	Percentage change from previous month						
1963							
October	+2.1	+0.6	+12.9	+1.7	+1.7	+1.3	+2.8
November	-1.5	-.9	-9.1	-1.5	-.9	-.5	-2.4
December	+2.3	+.6	+4.3	+.4	+1.0	+3.1	+12.9
1964							
January	+1.2	(5/)	+2.4	-.1	+.8	+1.8	+7.2
February	+1.8	+1.4	+2.7	+.8	+2.0	+2.9	-2.6
March	+2.4	+.7	+9.2	+.8	+2.4	+3.1	+.7
April	+.7	-.6	+5.3	+.3	+1.2	+2.0	-4.3
May	-1.2	-.1	-3.6	+.4	+.8	-.8	-9.3
June	(5/)	(5/)	+4.6	-.1	+1.0	-1.0	-3.9
July	+.2	+.3	-1.6	+.3	+2.0	+.2	+.5
August	-.3	-2.0	+8.2	-.2	-.7	-.8	-.7
September	+.3	+.2	-2.5	-.2	+1.5	+1.0	+1.5
October	+2.5	+1.1	+14.3	+.7	+2.0	+1.3	+2.1

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Total exceeds sum of columns because of inclusion of vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special medical funds; data for such expenditures partly estimated for some States. 3/ Represents data for payments to recipients of the specified type of assistance under separate State programs and under State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Partly estimated. Excludes Idaho and Indiana for all months and Nebraska beginning November 1963; data not available. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 3. Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, October 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	September 1964 in--		October 1963 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total 2/.....	2,160,943	$170,461,400	$78.88	-0.1	+1.1	-1.6	+0.6
Ala.....	111,087	7,578,387	68.22	+.2	+1.2	+2.8	+4.3
Alaska 3/.....	1,396	4/ 112,168	80.35	+.9	-9.2	+.4	-5.8
Ariz.....	13,314	841,597	63.21	+.1	+.1	-.8	+.5
Ark.....	58,792	3,780,068	64.30	+.2	+.6	+2.0	+5.8
Calif.....	271,488	29,952,685	110.33	-.2	+1.4	+1.5	+4.2
Colo. 2/.....	44,724	4,142,373	92.62	+.2	+2.1	-9.3	-20.0
Conn.....	7,351	626,918	85.28	-.9	+4.4	-12.5	-2.2
Del.....	1,350	90,016	66.68	+.5	+4.3	+19.3	+29.8
D. C.....	2,403	197,432	82.16	-.1	-6.5	-4.6	-6.5
Fla. 3/.....	72,975	4,867,486	66.70	+.1	-.7	+2.9	+7.5
Ga.....	92,258	5,168,955	56.03	(5/)	-.7	+.1	+.7
Guam 6/.....	159	5,629	35.40	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	1,165	84,590	72.61	-.4	+15.3	+3.0	+4.9
Idaho.....	4,491	322,468	71.80	-1.3	-1.5	-10.7	-10.6
Ill. 3/.....	57,044	5,379,607	94.31	-.2	+1.8	-7.0	+1.9
Ind.....	23,035	1,884,821	81.82	0	-.4	-2.5	+5.4
Iowa.....	27,966	2,583,141	92.37	-.8	-.7	-5.5	-3.6
Kans.....	21,980	2,073,843	94.35	+.3	+9.4	-9.3	-6.5
Ky. 3/.....	57,353	3,396,389	59.22	+.3	-1.4	+3.6	+2.8
La.....	130,712	11,124,780	85.11	+.2	+.2	+1.4	+4.0
Maine 3/.....	11,086	918,296	82.83	-.3	-1.9	-1.3	-2.5
Md. 3/.....	9,831	716,314	72.86	+.9	+1.2	+4.1	+5.5
Mass.....	53,640	4,858,869	90.56	-.2	+.9	-3.9	-4.9
Mich.....	49,460	4,567,831	92.35	+.1	+2.4	-2.3	+12.1
Minn.....	32,932	2,777,796	84.35	-.9	-6.4	-24.3	-42.1
Miss.....	73,658	2,882,622	39.14	-.2	-.8	-3.2	-2.0
Mo.....	102,897	6,962,908	67.67	(7/)	(5/)	-2.0	+1.6
Mont.....	5,326	383,993	72.10	-.6	-.4	-6.5	-1.1
Nebr.....	12,523	1,159,787	92.61	-.5	+.7	-1.9	+11.1
Nev.....	2,619	234,959	89.71	+.9	+.7	+1.8	+3.6
N. H.....	4,436	456,966	103.01	+.1	+1.8	-3.6	-1.4
N. J.....	13,885	1,126,473	81.13	-.3	-.4	-1.5	+.1
N. Mex. 3/.....	10,753	852,742	79.30	-.4	-.4	-1.4	-1.2
N. Y.....	56,351	5,414,374	96.08	+.3	+4.3	(7/)	+5.5
N. C.....	43,280	2,638,205	60.96	-.4	-1.6	-2.2	+3.8
N. Dak. 3/.....	5,287	476,016	90.04	-.8	-.2	-5.5	+1.5
Ohio.....	83,217	7,175,924	86.23	-.1	+.9	-2.9	-1.2
Okla. 3/.....	83,145	8,029,863	96.58	-.2	+1.3	-.7	+1.6
Oreg.....	10,596	762,481	71.96	-1.1	+.8	-12.8	-9.6
Pa.....	46,521	4,173,193	89.71	-.1	+28.9	-2.2	+14.5
P. R.....	31,382	293,374	9.35	-.4	-2.3	-6.3	-8.2
R. I. 3/.....	5,994	566,860	94.57	-.4	-.3	-1.3	+10.9
S. C.....	25,814	1,374,999	53.27	-.5	+1.7	-4.2	+2.4
S. Dak.....	7,184	607,143	84.51	-.4	-.3	-4.8	-1.9
Tenn.....	45,128	2,417,324	53.57	-.2	-.5	-4.4	+2.8
Tex.....	229,996	16,110,196	70.05	+.1	+.1	+1.0	+.7
Utah.....	4,894	336,472	68.75	-.2	+6.3	-7.8	-5.7
Vt. 3/.....	5,446	463,078	85.03	+.3	-.4	(7/)	+1.7
V. I.....	446	17,936	40.22	-.2	+7.5	-7.1	+1.0
Va.....	13,407	847,420	63.21	+.2	-1.4	-1.0	+1.8
Wash.....	32,965	2,654,299	80.52	-.4	-1.1	-5.5	-1.9
W. Va.....	14,375	711,279	49.48	-.4	-.1	-6.1	-1.0
Wis.....	28,933	3,067,928	106.04	-.7	-1.6	-4.2	-.2
Wyo.....	2,493	210,127	84.29	-.7	-2.8	-3.6	-2.4

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes 3,810 recipients aged 60-64 in Colorado and payments of $333,042 to these recipients. Such payments were made without Federal participation. 3/ Represents aid to the aged under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ In addition, supplemental payments of $12,736 from general assistance funds were made to 37 recipients. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Data for June; later data not available. 7/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 4. Medical assistance for the aged: Recipients and payments for recipients, by State, October 1964 1/

State	Number of recipients 2/	Payments for recipients		Percentage change from September 1964	
		Total amount	Average	Number	Amount
Total.....	220,783	$43,739,320	$198.11	+6.0	+14.3
Ala.....	250	74,739	298.96	+16.8	+16.5
Ark.....	2,878	168,109	58.41	+9.4	+14.9
Calif.....	27,271	8,048,546	295.13	-6.2	-3.6
Colo.....	4,133	3/ 729,771	176.57	+2.4	-3.4
Conn.....	6,421	3/ 1,338,218	208.41	+4.6	+7.3
D. C.....	845	230,268	272.51	+6.2	+3.8
Fla. 4/.....	522	200,046	383.23	+3.2	+5.2
Guam 5/.....	23	1,108	(6/)	---	---
Hawaii 4/.....	511	137,688	269.45	-1.2	-4.3
Idaho.....	2,152	293,860	136.55	+.6	-.3
Ill. 4/.....	1,175	503,859	428.82	+23.8	+54.2
Iowa.....	6,695	510,634	76.27	+6.3	+6.0
Kans.....	2,643	3/ 404,668	153.11	+5.8	+25.4
Ky. 4/.....	7,758	225,359	29.05	-9.2	-7.1
La.....	434	86,801	200.00	-7.3	-2.1
Maine 4/.....	465	123,242	265.04	+20.8	+26.9
Md. 4/.....	10,590	370,804	35.01	+.9	-4.0
Mass.....	27,146	3/ 4,456,778	164.18	-.7	-.7
Mich.....	5,669	2,007,973	354.20	+.1	-5.3
Minn.....	11,146	3/ 2,261,643	202.91	+6.7	+6.3
Nebr.....	158	52,682	333.43	+28.5	+31.4
N. H.....	1,758	91,140	51.84	+41.0	+58.3
N. J.....	5,265	3/ 1,275,443	242.25	-.6	-3.8
N. Y.....	35,550	3/ 11,530,006	324.33	+7.7	+25.3
N. C.....	413	132,548	320.94	(7/)	(7/)
N. Dak. 4/.....	8/ 1,224	3/ 261,509	213.65	+1.5	-.3
Okla. 4/.....	1,141	189,307	165.91	+23.4	+41.1
Oreg.....	3,885	552,574	142.23	+8.8	+8.6
Pa.....	13,421	4,162,162	310.12	+62.4	+130.6
P. R.....	4,164	110,860	26.62	+16.6	-3.2
S. C.....	1,226	206,906	168.77	+41.9	+45.1
S. Dak.....	379	19,960	52.66	+8.3	-18.7
Tenn.....	7,204	295,887	41.07	-20.7	-12.9
Utah.....	2,196	249,536	113.63	+10.1	+9.7
Vt. 4/.....	109	31,222	286.44	-22.7	-4.0
V. I.....	90	1,224	13.60	(6/)	(6/)
Va.....	1,888	181,528	96.15	+21.8	+24.2
Wash.....	9,720	1,365,244	140.46	-1.6	-2.8
W. Va.....	9,565	219,458	22.94	+39.5	+47.2
Wis.....	2,684	625,415	233.02	+125.7	+158.2
Wyo.....	16	10,595	(6/)	(6/)	(6/)

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Persons for whom vendor payments were made during the report month. 3/ Includes money payments not subject to Federal participation as follows: $40 in Colorado, $104 in Connecticut, $10,991 in Kansas, $99,332 in Massachusetts, $35,138 in Minnesota, $8,100 in New Jersey, $51,860 in New York, and $2,571 in North Dakota. 4/ Represents medical assistance for the aged under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged. 5/ Data for June; later data not available. 6/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 7/ First payments made in October 1964. 8/ Includes an unknown number of cases receiving only money payments.

Table 5. Aid to the blind: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, October 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	September 1964 in--		October 1964 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total 2/....	96,586	$8,237,410	$85.29	-0.3	+0.7	-1.6	+1.6
Ala.....	1,806	122,552	67.86	+.4	+1.1	+5.2	+49.5
Alaska 3/.....	109	8,649	79.35	-.9	-.6	+3.8	+ 8.0
Ariz.....	828	59,869	72.31	+.7	+.9	-1.8	- 2.3
Ark.....	1,950	139,401	71.49	+.2	+2.3	-1.7	+ 5.3
Calif. 2/.....	12,439	1,663,360	133.72	-.7	+1.1	+1.2	+ 6.7
Colo.....	257	19,908	77.46	+.8	-4.5	0	- 5.0
Conn.....	320	41,492	129.66	+1.9	+22.1	+2.9	+35.6
Del.....	299	25,932	86.73	+ .3	+ 6.3	+2.7	+18.6
D. C.....	201	14,893	74.09	-.5	+.2	+12.3	+13.7
Fla. 3/.....	2,598	175,844	67.68	-.2	-1.6	+ 1.0	+1.8
Ga.....	3,200	192,962	60.30	+.1	+ 2.0	+2.3	+4.2
Guam 4/.....	6	132	(5/)	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	74	7,967	107.66	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)
Idaho.....	135	9,832	72.83	+1.5	+2.1	7.1	+12.3
Ill. 3/.....	2,489	235,214	94.50	-.6	+.8	-9.2	-7.9
Ind.....	1,773	156,725	88.40	+.5	+4.2	-2.1	+3.6
Iowa.....	1,179	117,590	99.74	-.4	-1.1	-5.5	-6.7
Kans.....	517	50,570	97.81	+1.6	+8.2	-2.8	+.4
Ky. 3/.....	2,450	171,621	70.05	+.4	-.3	+2.4	+4.9
La.....	2,803	227,455	81.15	-.1	-.6	-.3	-.5
Maine 3/.....	326	27,312	83.78	-.9	-1.0	-18.1	-16.9
Md. 3/.....	385	31,338	81.40	-1.5	(6/)	-4.2	+.8
Mass.....	2,275	309,810	136.18	-1.0	-5.9	-1.0	-8.5
Mich.....	1,663	149,248	89.75	-.4	+4.8	-1.7	+9.1
Minn.....	1,060	116,818	110.21	-.5	-.5	+1.5	-3.8
Miss.....	2,740	121,843	44.47	-1.1	-3.4	-10.4	-7.3
Mo. 2/.....	4,499	337,425	75.00	-1.0	-1.0	-3.1	+3.9
Mont.....	247	20,555	83.22	-1.2	-.8	-7.8	-4.0
Nebr.....	635	69,198	108.97	-.8	+3.1	-3.8	+6.2
Nev.....	159	18,367	115.52	-1.2	-3.2	-3.6	-6.2
N. H.....	271	29,193	107.72	+3.4	+3.7	0	+.3
N. J.....	943	81,073	85.97	-.3	-2.1	-.6	+3.6
N. Mex. 3/.....	346	32,913	95.12	+.3	+1.0	+.9	+3.1
N. Y.....	3,135	367,582	117.25	-.5	+5.5	-3.1	+2.0
N. C.....	5,015	338,966	67.59	-.2	-.4	-2.2	+2.5
N. Dak. 3/.....	77	6,271	81.44	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)
Ohio.....	3,345	276,265	82.59	-.2	+1.6	-2.2	-7.6
Okla. 3/.....	1,656	203,918	123.14	-.5	+.8	-3.1	(7/)
Oreg.....	423	38,105	90.08	-1.6	+3.1	+8.5	+12.2
Pa 2/.....	17,816	1,349,806	75.76	-.1	+1.3	-.8	-.3
P. R.....	1,418	11,849	8.36	-1.7	-1.6	-10.0	-9.8
R. I. 3/.....	103	9,302	90.31	+3.0	+1.4	(5/)	(5/)
S. C.....	1,821	113,288	62.21	+1.2	+1.2	+7.1	+5.6
S. Dak.....	119	8,380	70.42	-2.5	-1.6	-11.9	-5.9
Tenn.....	2,147	111,482	51.92	-.5	+.2	-7.7	-7.0
Tex.....	4,756	329,820	69.35	-.3	-.3	-3.8	-3.6
Utah.....	172	11,930	69.36	+.6	-9.4	-2.8	-9.5
Vt. 3/.....	117	8,450	72.22	+.9	+1.4	+7.3	+18.5
V. I.....	15	591	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)
Va.....	1,138	80,828	71.03	+.7	+2.3	-1.3	+7.6
Wash.....	670	58,747	87.68	-.3	-8.8	+.3	-1.9
W. Va.....	804	38,144	47.44	-.6	-.9	-6.3	-7.0
Wis.....	799	81,703	102.26	+.5	-.6	-4.3	+.3
Wyo.....	58	4,922	84.86	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Data include recipients of payments made without Federal participation and payments to these recipients as follows: California, $19,885 to 129 recipients; Missouri, $50,751 to 673 recipients; and Pennsylvania, $944,475 to 12,877 recipients. 3/ Represents aid to the blind under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Data for June; later data not available. 5/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 6/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 7/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent

Table 6. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, October 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	September 1964 in--		October 1963 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total.....	519,057	$41,281,977	$79.53	+0.8	+2.0	+9.2	+13.8
Ala.....	14,835	685,880	46.23	+.6	+1.3	+6.5	+9.0
Alaska 2/.....	176	26,403	150.02	-8.8	+5.9	(3/)	(3/)
Ariz.....	3,200	215,526	67.35	+3.0	+2.9	+38.7	+37.6
Ark.....	9,363	564,955	60.34	+.4	+.8	+3.9	+9.5
Calif.....	53,190	6,145,019	115.53	+2.0	+4.1	+38.7	+46.9
Colo.....	10,093	393,528	38.99	+.4	-16.2	+71.7	-9.0
Conn.....	7,554	630,542	83.47	+1.8	+14.7	+9.5	+42.2
Del.....	430	31,988	74.39	+.2	+1.1	+2.6	+5.8
D. C.....	3,186	252,169	79.15	+1.1	+1.0	+9.1	+11.9
Fla. 2/.....	16,884	1,211,117	71.73	(4/)	(5/)	+11.1	+13.7
Ga.....	26,672	1,582,150	59.32	+.5	-1.8	+4.6	+4.7
Guam 6/.....	54	1,348	24.96	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 2/.....	1,035	129,555	125.17	+1.2	+6.5	-1.1	+12.7
Idaho.....	2,937	166,563	56.71	+1.0	+1.0	+16.2	+20.5
Ill. 2/.....	28,459	2,745,801	96.48	+.3	+.9	+2.3	+1.2
Ind.....	1,298	145,665	112.22	+1.2	-2.5	+111.7	+91.5
Iowa.....	1,208	100,014	82.79	+1.5	+1.7	+20.9	+21.4
Kans.....	4,800	542,745	113.07	+1.7	+6.8	+9.7	+15.7
Ky. 2/.....	10,283	739,567	71.92	+.3	-2.4	+9.4	+9.0
La.....	19,268	1,124,622	58.37	+.3	+.5	+4.3	+5.6
Maine 2/.....	2,247	197,421	87.86	+.3	+.2	-6.7	-6.2
Md. 2/.....	7,609	598,477	78.65	+.7	+1.4	+10.5	+12.8
Mass.....	12,335	1,747,345	141.66	+1.7	+1.8	+13.2	+14.3
Mich.....	8,832	951,688	107.75	+4.8	+5.5	+25.8	+29.5
Minn.....	3,623	221,421	61.12	+2.1	-.6	+12.6	+12.7
Miss.....	18,227	791,603	43.43	+1.0	+.9	+12.4	+11.3
Mo.....	14,890	1,054,125	70.79	+.8	+.9	+2.0	+7.1
Mont.....	1,307	101,947	78.00	+.3	-.2	+3.4	+6.5
Nebr.....	2,543	240,719	94.66	+.8	+2.9	+10.7	+27.7
N. H.....	590	67,648	114.66	+1.0	+2.5	+7.9	+9.8
N. J.....	8,597	840,819	97.80	+.2	+1.3	+7.1	+11.5
N. Mex. 2/.....	3,810	347,833	91.29	+.9	+1.2	+13.1	+14.3
N. Y.....	35,006	4,598,772	131.37	+.2	+4.0	-.3	+5.0
N. C.....	22,051	1,566,888	71.06	+.8	+1.8	+3.8	+8.5
N. Dak. 2/.....	1,557	181,977	116.88	+1.8	+2.4	+19.5	+32.8
Ohio.....	19,292	1,482,220	76.83	+.7	-.1	+6.0	+.7
Okla. 2/.....	13,588	1,519,911	111.86	+.8	+2.0	+12.2	+15.7
Oreg.....	7,865	530,335	67.43	+1.4	+4.1	+2.3	+4.7
Pa.....	20,103	1,546,882	76.95	+.5	+5.1	+3.8	+21.2
P. R.....	21,024	182,010	8.66	-.3	+.4	-2.9	-2.2
R. I. 2/.....	2,763	259,527	93.93	+.3	-.3	+3.4	+6.7
S. C.....	8,826	492,961	55.85	+1.0	+6.1	+5.3	+12.4
S. Dak.....	1,105	76,436	69.17	+2.1	+1.7	-.4	+1.5
Tenn.....	12,883	657,391	51.03	+.8	+.2	+4.6	+6.6
Tex.....	9,641	551,482	57.20	+1.0	+1.0	+10.6	+10.1
Utah.....	4,924	343,607	69.78	+1.2	+7.5	+5.9	+5.2
Vt. 2/.....	1,146	94,355	82.33	+2.8	+4.9	+19.7	+40.8
V. I.....	86	3,458	40.21	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)
Va.....	6,842	457,711	66.90	+.3	-2.8	+4.7	+7.3
Wash.....	18,203	1,097,215	60.28	(4/)	-.6	-.4	+4.9
W. Va.....	5,948	301,309	50.66	-.8	-.9	-8.3	+5.4
Wis.....	6,037	688,591	114.06	+.5	+1.5	+9.3	+10.9
Wyo.....	632	52,736	83.44	+1.4	-.5	+6.6	+3.9

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Represents aid to the permanently and totally disabled under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 3/ Percentage change not computed on fewer than 100 recipients. 4/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 5/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Data for June; later data not available.

Table 7. Aid to families with dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State October 1964 1/

(Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments)

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
					Average per--		Sept. 1964 in--		October 1963 in--	
		Total 2/	Children	Total amount	Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total 3/ 4/...	1,005,880	4,174,728	3,138,039	$139,484,356	$138.67	$33.41	+0.4	+1.3	+6.8	+13.0
Ala. 3/.....	19,216	78,810	62,256	915,387	47.64	11.62	-1.8	-2.0	-13.0	-13.1
Alaska 3/.....	1,218	4,405	3,360	155,153	127.38	35.22	-2.5	-1.1	+.8	+3.2
Ariz. 3/.....	9,184	39,390	29,771	1,128,320	122.86	28.64	-2.7	-4.0	-6.1	-6.0
Ark.....	6,985	28,809	21,644	483,447	69.21	16.78	(5/)	-.7	+9.4	+6.8
Calif. 3/ 4/..	118,809	481,246	359,157	21,078,408	177.41	43.80	+3.1	+3.0	+32.8	+33.2
Colo.....	10,468	41,072	31,923	1,439,904	137.55	35.06	+.2	+.6	+4.1	-2.1
Conn. 4/.....	14,486	57,523	41,790	2,707,265	186.89	47.06	-.6	+1.1	+19.0	+23.2
Del. 4/.....	2,520	11,531	8,753	316,408	125.56	27.44	+4.3	+3.3	+21.1	+51.2
D. C.....	4,113	19,644	15,803	643,515	156.46	32.76	+.6	+.9	+8.1	+9.3
Fla.....	27,784	105,492	84,965	1,691,306	60.87	16.03	+.8	+.4	+1.1	-.8
Ga.....	16,732	67,590	51,771	1,493,876	89.28	22.10	+2.5	+2.5	+15.4	+9.7
Guam 6/.....	123	629	524	7,767	63.15	12.35	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 4/.....	3,163	13,580	10,086	469,112	148.31	34.54	+.9	+2.0	-.3	-.6
Idaho.....	2,456	9,440	6,891	362,230	147.49	38.37	-.3	+.2	-2.5	-5.7
Ill. 3/ 4/....	54,777	257,606	198,406	11,518,875	210.29	44.72	-.5	+.1	-.3	+5.7
Ind. 3/.....	11,831	48,068	35,907	1,386,943	117.23	28.85	-.3	+.1	+2.3	+6.7
Iowa.....	10,694	42,926	31,240	1,648,159	154.12	38.40	+.8	+1.2	+.3	+2.8
Kans. 3/ 4/...	8,262	34,879	26,789	1,384,506	167.58	39.69	+1.2	+4.9	+14.8	+19.7
Ky. 3/.....	20,341	78,896	56,918	1,948,654	95.80	24.70	+.2	+1.0	+4.3	+4.7
La. 3/.....	23,514	102,767	77,863	2,364,182	100.54	23.01	+.1	-.1	+4.4	+4.5
Maine.....	5,185	18,823	13,888	545,143	105.14	28.96	-1.1	-.9	-10.5	-11.4
Md. 3/ 4/.....	17,511	75,027	57,903	2,475,885	141.39	33.00	+2.0	+2.3	+21.9	+24.2
Mass. 4/.....	24,459	91,696	68,688	4,399,889	179.89	47.98	+.4	+1.5	+14.4	+12.2
Mich. 3/ 4/...	38,808	157,446	115,722	5,721,055	147.42	36.34	-1.1	+2.7	+25.7	+24.9
Minn. 3/.....	13,331	49,452	38,462	2,450,999	183.86	49.56	+.5	-.6	+13.6	+13.4
Miss.....	20,813	82,976	66,360	820,380	39.42	9.89	-.3	-.2	+2.4	+5.0
Mo. 3/.....	25,949	105,954	80,840	2,567,074	98.93	24.23	+.1	+.1	+1.3	+3.3
Mont.....	1,726	6,899	5,324	244,356	141.57	35.42	-.9	-1.1	+.5	+5.3
Nebr.....	3,761	15,552	11,948	472,400	125.60	30.38	+1.6	+.6	+13.5	+15.5
Nev.....	1,168	4,775	3,779	149,087	127.64	31.22	+1.1	+1.2	-2.4	-3.7
N. H.....	1,062	4,366	3,263	191,159	180.00	43.78	+1.4	+4.3	+4.0	+6.1
N. J.....	25,777	101,726	77,083	4,993,223	193.71	49.09	+.8	+1.0	+10.3	+14.9
N. Mex. 3/....	7,595	31,052	23,558	1,067,542	140.56	34.38	-.2	+.1	+.3	+2.0
N. Y. 4/.....	115,450	496,188	365,124	23,887,987	206.91	48.14	+.7	+3.0	+12.0	+22.0
N. Car. 3/....	26,304	108,963	81,256	2,664,862	101.31	24.46	+2.5	+3.8	-1.7	+2.2
N. Dak.....	1,894	7,476	5,699	320,137	169.03	42.82	+.8	+3.7	+13.3	+17.9
Ohio 4/.....	41,099	169,892	127,015	5,420,903	131.90	31.91	+.3	+.4	+12.3	+16.1
Okla. 3/ 4/...	18,504	72,849	54,067	2,391,031	129.22	32.82	-.3	-5.7	+1.5	-4.3
Oreg. 3/ 4/...	7,081	27,663	20,563	1,063,236	150.15	38.44	+3.2	-3.1	-1.1	(7/)
Pa. 4/.....	67,600	297,944	213,707	9,367,594	138.57	31.44	-1.3	+1.6	-6.0	+3.7
P. R.....	50,293	202,628	162,639	835,671	16.62	4.12	-.5	-.2	-5.3	+8.7
R. I. 4/.....	5,770	23,232	17,066	985,964	170.88	42.44	-1.2	-.5	+5.4	+12.3
S. C.....	7,353	29,490	23,699	479,085	65.16	16.25	-.5	+1.3	-8.7	-7.0
S. Dak.....	2,814	10,492	7,926	329,027	116.93	31.36	+.3	-1.6	+2.6	-6.4
Tenn. 3/.....	19,005	75,520	57,138	1,525,039	80.24	20.19	-.8	-.4	-2.8	+6.1
Tex.....	19,202	87,874	66,259	1,618,142	84.27	18.41	+.6	+1.3	+3.1	+5.2
Utah. 3/ 4/...	4,828	20,110	14,657	667,145	138.18	33.17	-.8	-.5	+10.5	+11.0
Vt.....	1,393	5,431	3,999	160,099	114.93	29.48	-.6	-.9	+13.2	+10.5
V. I.....	310	1,161	978	21,121	68.13	18.19	+.5	+4.5	+3.4	+24.9
Va. 3/.....	10,566	45,022	34,662	1,097,336	103.86	24.37	+.3	-.6	+3.4	+4.7
Wash. 3/ 4/...	15,723	61,425	44,270	2,162,669	137.55	35.21	+1.3	-3.3	+16.8	+12.6
W. Va. 3/ 4/..	24,821	114,003	78,874	3,024,547	121.85	26.53	-.4	-.3	-6.7	-7.3
Wis. 3/.....	11,181	43,972	33,213	2,095,783	187.44	47.66	-1.0	+2.5	+3.1	+2.5
Wyo.....	868	3,346	2,593	125,369	144.43	37.47	+.2	-3.3	+6.5	+4.7

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ Includes data on foster-family care; see table 10. 4/ Includes data on unemployed-parent segment; see table 8. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Data for June; later data not available. 7/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 8. Aid to families with dependent children, unemployed-parent segment: Recipients and payments to recipients, October 1964 1/

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
					Average per--		September 1964 in--		October 1963 in--	
		Total 2/	Children	Total	Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total....	57,278	331,994	223,074	$10,667,649	$186.24	$32.13	-2.3	-1.7	+22.7	+31.7
Calif....	8,451	49,212	33,600	1,745,814	206.58	35.48	+2.2	+.2	(3/)	(3/)
Conn.....	1,791	9,992	6,576	330,796	184.70	33.11	-6.5	-2.4	+4.4	4.0
Del.....	290	1,727	1,176	43,259	149.17	25.05	+13.9	+5.1	+6.9	+22.9
Hawaii...	277	1,758	1,214	47,649	172.02	27.10	+.2	-4.4	-13.1	-16.7
Ill.....	6,100	39,618	27,654	1,639,136	268.71	41.37	-3.9	-3.9	-18.3	-11.9
Kans.....	360	2,192	1,484	70,799	196.66	32.30	-.2	+5.6	+128.6	+104.6
Md.....	374	2,340	1,612	65,973	176.40	28.19	+4.7	+2.1	+10.7	+11.8
Mass.....	629	3,455	2,317	121,172	192.64	35.07	+.6	-4.4	+13.8	+14.6
Mich.....	3,384	21,188	14,521	685,737	202.64	32.36	-8.8	-1.2	(3/)	(3/)
N. Y.....	13,334	77,444	52,587	2,670,390	200.27	34.48	-.8	-.2	+6.9	+15.4
Ohio.....	1,958	11,120	7,435	332,622	169.88	39.91	-2.0	-3.4	(3/)	(3/)
Okla.....	18	97	65	2,942	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	-3.0	+.8
Oreg.....	487	2,835	1,986	102,086	209.62	36.01	+21.4	+15.7	+46.2	+47.6
Pa.....	7,036	38,901	25,374	961,829	136.70	24.73	-6.8	-3.0	-31.5	-27.7
R. I.....	480	2,737	1,798	100,104	208.55	36.57	-5.8	-5.9	-11.6	-3.1
Utah.....	786	4,420	3,062	69,593	88.54	15.75	-6.7	-26.5	+11.2	-12.9
Wash.....	1,467	7,997	5,098	201,498	137.35	25.20	-5.1	-9.2	+40.3	+55.7
W. Va....	10,056	54,961	35,515	1,476,250	146.80	26.86	-1.1	-1.2	-6.5	-7.7

1/ Data for this segment of the program, shown separately here, are included in data for the total program. All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ No program in operation in October 1963. 4/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 families; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients.

Table 9. Aid to families with dependent children: Recipients and money payments to recipients under community work and training programs, by State, October 1964 1/

State	Number of families with an adult on work and training programs	Number of recipients				Money payments to recipients			
		Total 2/	Adults		Children	Total	For work performed on work and training programs	Average per family	
			On work and training programs	Other				Total	For work performed on work and training programs
Total.....	18,953	107,815	18,959	17,407	71,449	$3,129,742	$2,333,355	$165.13	$123.11
Calif.....	3,969	23,094	3,969	3,572	15,553	863,662	292,470	217.60	73.69
Ill. 3/.....	2,480	15,701	2,482	2,187	11,032	565,777	426,630	228.14	172.03
Kans.....	74	427	74	71	282	19,932	9,268	269.35	125.24
Md.....	116	736	116	113	507	21,214	14,180	182.88	122.24
Ohio.....	1,245	7,166	1,249	1,088	4,829	204,577	180,448	164.32	144.94
Oreg.....	121	673	121	94	458	25,661	7,328	212.07	60.56
Pa. 3/.....	627	3,567	627	627	2,313	110,624	89,622	176.43	142.94
Wash.....	265	1,490	265	265	960	38,700	33,814	146.04	127.60
W. Va.....	10,056	54,961	10,056	9,390	35,515	1,279,595	1,279,595	127.25	127.25

1/ Represents data for community work and training programs under plans for such programs submitted under Section 409 of Social Security Act. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ Plan material submitted but not yet approved.

Table 10. Aid to families with dependent children receiving foster care: Recipients and payments for foster care, by State, October 1964 1/

State	Number of--				Payments for foster care			
	Children receiving foster care			Families from which children were removed	Total amount	Average per child	In foster homes	In institutions
	Total	In foster homes	In institutions					
Total.....	4,982	2/ 4,102	2/ 224	2,112	$361,237	$72.51	2/ $270,761	2/ $34,333
Ala.....	11	11	0	5	421	(3/)	421	0
Alaska.....	59	59	0	21	5,367	90.97	5,367	0
Ariz.....	182	182	0	69	11,465	62.99	11,465	0
Calif.....	1,094	978	116	538	103,570	94.67	79,297	24,273
Ill.....	656	(2/)	(2/)	260	56,143	85.58	(2/)	(2/)
Ind.....	97	97	0	35	3,851	39.70	3,851	0
Kans.....	66	57	9	32	5,861	88.80	5,315	546
Ky.....	15	15	0	6	1,050	(3/)	1,050	0
La.....	484	454	30	197	30,359	62.73	27,623	2,736
Md.....	414	387	27	149	30,381	73.38	28,119	2,262
Mich.....	51	49	2	19	3,572	70.04	3,332	240
Minn.....	174	158	16	82	14,624	84.05	11,832	2,792
Mo.....	58	58	0	19	1,838	31.69	1,838	0
N. Mex.....	55	55	0	16	3,393	61.69	3,393	0
N. C.....	20	20	0	5	906	(3/)	906	0
Okla.....	265	265	0	115	12,336	46.55	12,336	0
Oreg.....	96	96	0	37	6,867	71.53	6,867	0
Tenn.....	244	230	14	79	15,931	65.29	15,002	929
Utah.....	223	223	0	96	13,236	59.35	13,236	0
Va.....	48	48	0	18	2,057	(3/)	2,057	0
Wash.....	502	502	0	234	27,560	54.90	27,560	0
W. Va.....	33	23	10	19	1,895	(3/)	1,340	555
Wis.....	135	135	0	61	8,554	63.36	8,554	0

1/ Data for this segment of the program, shown separately here, are included in data for the total program. All data subject to revision. 2/ Excludes Illinois; breakdown not available. 3/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 children.

Table 11. General assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, October 1964 1/

[Excludes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of--		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
				Average per--		September 1964 in--		October 1963 in--	
	Cases	Recipients	Total amount	Case	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total 2/	319,000	691,000	$21,674,000	$67.98	$31.36	-1.5	+2.1	-9.4	-0.1
Ala.	73	73	915	12.53	12.53	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)
Alaska	196	479	9,421	48.07	19.67	+12.7	-.6	-37.0	-44.2
Ariz.	2,051	5,162	109,484	53.38	21.21	-1.2	-1.9	+7.1	-10.6
Ark.	359	1,296	5,601	15.60	4.32	+13.4	+26.2	+1.2	+9.1
Calif.	23,716	38,088	1,446,468	60.99	37.98	-7.8	-.6	-47.2	-27.7
Colo.	1,158	3,821	52,857	45.65	13.83	-1.2	+8.5	-1.8	+7.2
Conn.	4/ 4,021	4/ 9,760	4/ 268,828	66.86	27.54	+1.2	+7.8	-9.3	-11.5
Del.	1,412	2,562	74,239	52.58	28.98	+.2	+.3	+4.1	+3.9
D. C.	680	740	52,198	76.76	70.54	-2.5	+.2	+21.3	+27.6
Fla. 5/	8,000	(6/)	248,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Ga.	2,338	5,629	72,738	31.11	12.92	-3.5	+1.5	+4.6	-.5
Guam 7/	14	29	524	(3/)	(3/)	---	---	---	---
Hawaii	1,062	1,351	75,109	70.72	55.60	+.3	+.4	-.4	+7.4
Ill.	26,830	55,951	2,251,412	83.91	40.24	-4.7	+.6	+.7	+1.3
Iowa 5/	3,500	7,800	131,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Kans.	2,714	6,407	183,681	67.68	28.67	-8.5	-4.4	-12.8	(8/)
Ky.	1,345	3,827	48,383	35.97	12.64	-14.6	-4.1	-23.2	-14.9
La.	8,219	8,997	428,162	52.09	47.59	-.4	-.2	+3.0	+4.0
Maine	2,183	6,947	95,615	43.80	13.76	-6.7	-10.0	-11.7	-5.1
Md.	6,635	7,531	488,260	73.59	64.83	+2.2	+2.2	+32.6	+33.3
Mass.	7,623	15,192	525,529	68.94	34.59	-1.4	-6.2	-.2	-1.9
Mich.	22,508	71,073	1,933,052	85.88	27.20	+13.5	+13.8	-25.0	-28.6
Minn.	9,601	25,155	780,941	81.34	31.05	+1.3	+2.9	+2.2	+4.8
Miss.	1,266	1,643	19,233	15.19	11.71	-6.1	-2.8	+24.8	+24.8
Mo.	9,736	12,596	641,463	65.89	50.93	+1.3	+1.4	+4.5	+4.4
Mont.	967	2,836	51,123	52.87	18.03	-13.5	-9.6	-22.1	-5.6
Nev.	328	601	19,983	60.92	33.25	+.7	+9.7	+4.2	+13.6
N. H.	931	3,090	55,801	59.94	18.06	+5.0	+3.6	+4.5	-1.0
N. J. 9/	9,256	29,608	1,139,748	123.14	38.49	+.3	+1.7	-1.3	+4.5
N. Mex.	585	821	22,134	37.84	26.96	-9.4	+12.3	-12.5	-4.9
N. Y. 10/	45,176	99,391	3,970,348	87.89	39.95	+1.9	+4.4	+20.5	+32.5
N. C.	1,753	5,031	49,121	28.02	9.76	+6.9	-.3	+1.4	-8.8
N. Dak.	281	1,176	17,173	61.11	14.60	+5.6	+3.9	-1.6	-2.6
Ohio	27,118	87,879	1,929,019	71.13	21.95	-9.4	+.9	-12.4	-6.2
Okla.	8,073	(6/)	95,180	11.79	---	---	-8.5	---	-6.6
Oreg.	2,615	(6/)	171,756	65.68	---	---	-18.2	---	-30.6
Pa.	36,237	43,767	2,320,098	64.03	53.01	-.2	+.2	-3.2	+6.0
P. R.	1,311	1,311	10,034	7.65	7.65	+58.1	+53.0	-3.2	-2.8
R. I.	3,210	7,331	233,809	72.84	31.89	+5.2	+32.4	+17.0	+34.0
S. C.	1,258	1,468	39,857	31.68	27.15	-3.3	-2.5	+15.6	-11.2
S. Dak.	323	1,130	10,561	32.70	9.35	-1.1	-4.3	+22.6	+7.4
Tenn.	1,740	3,393	40,460	23.25	11.92	-6.6	+2.6	-33.9	+11.1
Tex. 11/ 12/	9,900	(6/)	336,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Utah	1,278	3,420	92,465	72.35	27.04	-19.7	-21.3	-5.4	+2.8
Vt. 11/ 12/	1,000	(6/)	25,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
V. I.	178	184	6,561	36.86	35.66	-1.6	+17.4	+17.9	+23.7
Va.	2,550	6,537	128,319	50.32	19.63	+1.5	+9.8	+20.1	+19.5
Wash.	7,525	12,832	517,318	68.75	40.31	+1.5	+1.5	-9.8	+3.7
W. Va.	1,625	2,854	58,673	36.11	20.56	+3.5	+1.4	+39.2	+26.7
Wis.	7,140	21,645	676,776	94.79	31.27	-1.4	+1.5	-3.8	-1.3
Wyo.	251	864	17,509	69.76	20.27	-16.6	-19.2	+7.3	+10.9

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Partly estimated; does not represent sum of State figures because totals exclude for New Jersey an estimated number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial and payments for such services; recipient count also includes an estimate for States not reporting such data. Excludes Idaho, Indiana, and Nebraska; data not available. 3/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 4/ About 11 percent of this total is estimated. 5/ Partly estimated. 6/ Data not available. 7/ Data for June; later data not available. 8/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 9/ Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial, and total payments for such services. 10/ Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care. 11/ Estimated on basis of reports from sample of local jurisdictions. 12/ Data for September; October data not available.

Table 12. Amount of vendor payments for medical care for recipients of public assistance, by program and State, October 1964 1/

State	Old-age assistance	Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	Aid to families with dependent children	General assistance 2/
Total.....	$35,903,352	$43,739,320	$996,096	$10,212,608	$12,361,157	$9,186,000
Ala.....	1,143,381	74,739	4,851	68,780	1,538	5
Alaska 3/.....	16,715	---	---	14,123	33	45,185
Ariz.....	63,923	---	---	---	---	---
Ark.....	738,388	168,109	20,765	197,988	44,035	29,112
Calif.....	3,820,798	8,048,546	209,619	1,127,573	1,251,665	124,670
Colo.....	551,049	4/ 729,771	3,285	---	103,482	69,947
Conn.....	169,387	4/ 1,338,218	20,788	304,451	410,954	(5/)
Del.....	18,204	---	2,224	---	---	---
D. C.....	45,631	230,268	403	26,131	756	100
Fla. 3/.....	1,242,732	200,046	20,601	258,084	57,763	---
Ga.....	795,760	---	14,274	135,254	---	---
Guam 6/.....	1,434	1,108	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	16,263	137,688	2,796	74,189	50,460	24,277
Idaho.....	45,098	293,860	85	22,378	---	---
Ill. 3/.....	2,650,442	503,859	75,088	808,714	1,573,053	7/ 769,819
Ind.....	849,864	---	47,367	83,013	226,624	---
Iowa.....	1,016,284	510,634	9,998	---	162,639	7/8/ 252,000
Kans.....	536,776	4/ 404,668	11,126	115,506	229,508	135,888
Ky. 3/.....	487,661	225,359	15,828	93,442	199,611	---
La.....	2,259,811	86,801	6,729	102,964	18,746	2,776
Maine 3/.....	326,978	123,242	3,749	41,570	25,925	82,930
Md. 3/.....	105,629	370,804	3,728	82,842	---	1,987
Mass.....	1,062,189	4/ 4,456,778	25,437	915,210	509,478	194,212
Mich.....	716,726	2,007,973	18,593	207,123	239,440	273,317
Minn.....	1,036,211	4/ 2,261,643	38,780	45,969	397,864	427,186
Miss.....	144,349	---	2,206	---	---	---
Mo.....	930,033	---	---	48,680	46,924	---
Mont.....	2,489	---	---	---	254	7/ 406,675
Nebr.....	647,068	52,682	34,573	120,624	44,406	---
Nev.....	60,155	---	3,565	(9/)	9,628	7/ 258,136
N. H.....	100,523	91,140	6,068	20,994	31,881	(5/)
N. J.....	260,130	4/ 1,275,443	10,039	245,969	252,009	303,586
N. Mex. 3/.....	228,620	---	7,540	83,760	139,766	14,322
N. Y.....	1,239,627	4/ 11,530,006	97,544	2,023,213	3,106,663	248,320
N. C.....	401,985	132,548	23,953	269,910	242,259	7/ 123,765
N. Dak. 3/.....	144,411	4/ 261,509	1,101	84,677	55,118	7/ 12,547
Ohio.....	1,693,093	---	44,163	280,218	525,934	7/ 1,212,292
Okla. 3/.....	1,609,860	189,307	32,329	262,347	36,500	(5/)
Oreg.....	142,788	552,574	4,413	169,573	77,259	70,484
Pa.....	1,202,269	4,162,162	74,707	398,308	953,608	1,158,393
P. R.....	27,443	110,860	---	---	---	---
R. I. 3/.....	102,617	---	1,802	53,132	148,453	7/ 85,832
S. C.....	335,801	206,906	13,720	92,639	31,754	12,670
S. Dak.....	107,760	19,960	---	---	---	7/ 106,137
Tenn.....	505,757	295,887	4,079	29,631	55,217	---
Tex.....	2,837,328	---	---	---	---	---
Utah.....	56,161	249,536	2,383	142,662	79,840	248
Vt. 3/.....	204,207	31,222	1,478	25,394	---	---
V. I.....	1,338	1,224	4	86	155	167
Va.....	241,200	181,528	14,579	80,828	42,750	7/ 24,715
Wash.....	611,465	1,365,244	13,066	522,094	277,439	110,336
W. Va.....	156,237	219,458	4,812	64,988	405,297	14,157
Wis.....	2,153,766	625,415	41,083	458,314	289,687	173,021
Wyo.....	37,538	10,595	775	9,263	4,782	41,282

1/ For State programs not shown, no vendor payments were made during the month or such payments were not reported. 2/ Includes vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special funds; total includes estimated amount for States reporting these data semiannually but not on a monthly basis. 3/ Except for aid to families with dependent children and general assistance, data represent payments for recipients of the specified type of assistance under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Includes money payments not subject to Federal participation as follows: $40 in Colorado, $104 in Connecticut, $10,991 in Kansas, $99,332 in Massachusetts, $35,138 in Minnesota, $8,100 in New Jersey, $51,860 in New York, and $2,571 in North Dakota. 5/ Data not available. 6/ Data for June; later data not available. 7/ Includes payments made in behalf of recipients of the special types of public assistance. 8/ Partly estimated. 9/ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Table 13. Average payment per recipient for all assistance, for money payments, and for vendor payments for medical care, by program and State, October 1964 1/

State	Old-age assistance			Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled			Aid to families with dependent children (per recipient)		
	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care		All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care
Total	$78.88	$62.27	$16.61	$198.11	$85.29	$74.97	$10.31	$79.53	$59.86	$19.68	$33.41	$30.45	$2.96
Ala.	68.22	57.93	10.29	298.96	67.86	65.17	2.69	46.23	41.60	4.64	11.62	11.60	.02
Alaska 2/	80.35	68.38	11.97	---	79.35	79.35	---	150.02	69.77	80.24	35.22	35.21	.01
Ariz.	63.21	58.41	4.80	---	72.31	72.31	---	67.35	67.35	---	28.64	28.64	---
Ark.	64.30	51.74	12.56	58.41	71.49	60.84	10.65	60.34	39.19	21.15	16.78	15.25	1.53
Calif.	110.33	96.25	14.07	295.13	133.72	116.87	16.85	115.53	94.33	21.20	43.80	41.20	2.60
Colo.	92.62	80.30	12.49	176.57	77.46	64.68	12.78	38.99	38.99	---	35.06	32.54	2.52
Conn.	85.28	62.24	23.04	208.41	129.66	64.70	64.96	83.47	43.17	40.30	47.06	39.92	7.14
Del.	66.68	53.19	13.48	---	86.73	79.29	7.44	74.39	74.39	---	27.44	27.44	---
D. C.	82.16	63.17	18.99	272.51	74.09	72.09	2.00	79.15	70.95	8.20	32.76	32.72	.04
Fla. 2/	66.70	49.67	17.03	383.23	67.68	59.75	7.93	71.73	56.45	15.29	16.03	15.48	.55
Ga.	56.03	47.40	8.63	---	60.30	55.84	4.46	59.32	54.25	5.07	22.10	22.10	---
Guam 3/	35.40	26.38	9.02	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	---	24.96	24.96	---	12.35	12.35	---
Hawaii 2/	72.61	58.65	13.96	269.45	107.66	69.88	37.78	125.17	53.49	71.68	34.54	30.83	3.72
Idaho	71.80	61.76	10.04	136.55	72.83	72.20	.63	56.71	49.09	7.62	38.37	38.37	---
Ill. 2/	94.31	47.84	46.46	428.82	94.50	64.33	30.17	96.48	68.07	28.42	44.72	38.61	6.11
Ind.	81.82	44.93	36.89	---	88.40	61.68	26.72	112.22	48.27	63.95	28.85	24.14	4.71
Iowa	92.37	56.03	36.34	76.27	99.74	91.26	8.48	82.79	82.79	---	38.40	34.61	3.79
Kans.	94.35	69.93	24.42	153.11	97.81	76.29	21.52	113.07	89.01	24.06	39.69	33.11	6.58
Ky 2/	59.22	50.72	8.50	29.05	70.05	63.59	6.46	71.92	62.83	9.09	24.70	22.17	2.53
La.	85.11	67.82	17.29	200.00	81.15	78.75	2.40	58.37	53.02	5.34	23.01	22.82	.18
Maine 2/	82.83	53.34	29.49	265.04	83.78	72.28	11.50	87.86	69.36	18.50	28.96	27.58	1.38
Md. 2/	72.86	62.12	10.74	35.01	81.40	71.71	9.68	78.65	67.77	10.89	33.00	33.00	---
Mass.	90.58	70.78	19.80	164.18	136.18	125.00	11.18	141.66	67.46	74.20	47.98	42.43	5.56
Mich.	92.35	77.86	14.49	354.20	89.75	78.57	11.18	107.75	84.30	23.45	36.34	34.82	1.52
Minn.	84.35	52.88	31.47	202.91	110.21	73.62	36.58	61.12	48.43	12.69	49.56	41.52	8.05
Miss.	39.14	37.18	1.96	---	44.47	43.66	.81	43.43	43.43	---	9.89	9.89	---
Mo.	67.67	58.63	9.04	---	75.00	75.00	---	70.79	67.52	3.27	24.23	23.79	.44
Mont.	72.10	71.63	.47	---	83.22	83.22	---	78.00	78.00	---	35.42	35.38	.04
Nebr.	92.61	40.94	51.67	333.43	108.97	54.53	54.45	94.66	47.23	47.43	30.38	27.52	2.86
Nev.	89.71	66.74	22.97	---	115.52	93.09	22.42	(5/)	(5/)	(5/)	31.22	29.21	2.02
N. H.	103.01	80.35	22.66	51.84	107.72	85.33	22.39	114.66	79.07	35.58	43.78	36.48	7.30
N. J.	81.13	62.39	18.73	242.25	85.97	75.33	10.65	97.80	69.19	28.61	49.09	46.61	2.48
N. Mex. 2/	79.30	58.04	21.26	---	95.12	73.33	21.79	91.29	69.31	21.98	34.38	29.88	4.50
N. Y.	96.08	74.08	22.00	324.33	117.25	86.14	31.11	131.37	73.57	57.80	48.14	41.88	6.26
N. C.	60.96	51.67	9.29	320.94	67.59	62.81	4.78	71.06	58.82	12.24	24.46	22.23	2.22
N. Dak. 2/	90.04	62.72	27.31	213.65	81.44	67.14	14.30	116.88	62.49	54.38	42.82	35.45	7.37
Ohio	86.23	65.89	20.35	---	82.59	69.39	13.20	76.83	62.31	14.53	31.91	28.81	3.10
Okla. 2/	96.58	77.21	19.36	165.91	123.14	103.62	19.52	111.86	92.55	19.31	32.82	32.32	.50
Oreg.	71.96	58.48	13.48	142.23	90.08	79.65	10.43	67.43	45.87	21.56	38.44	35.64	2.79
Pa.	89.71	63.86	25.84	310.12	75.76	71.57	4.19	76.95	57.13	19.81	31.44	28.24	3.20
P. R.	9.35	8.47	.87	26.62	8.36	8.36	---	8.66	8.66	---	4.12	4.12	---
R. I. 2/	94.57	77.45	17.12	---	90.31	72.82	17.50	93.93	74.70	19.23	42.44	36.05	6.39
S. C.	53.27	40.26	13.01	168.77	62.21	54.68	7.53	55.85	45.36	10.50	16.25	15.17	1.08
S. Dak.	84.51	69.51	15.00	52.66	70.42	70.42	---	69.17	69.17	---	31.36	31.36	---
Tenn.	53.57	42.36	11.21	41.07	51.92	50.02	1.90	51.03	48.73	2.30	20.19	19.46	.73
Tex.	70.05	57.71	12.34	---	69.35	69.36	---	57.20	57.20	---	18.41	18.41	---
Utah	68.75	57.28	11.48	113.63	69.36	55.51	13.85	69.78	40.81	28.97	33.17	29.20	3.97
Vt. 2/	85.03	47.53	37.50	286.44	72.22	59.59	12.63	82.33	60.18	22.16	29.48	29.48	---
V. I.	40.22	37.22	3.00	13.60	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	40.21	39.21	1.00	18.19	18.06	.13
Va.	63.21	45.22	17.99	96.15	71.03	58.22	12.81	66.90	55.08	11.81	24.37	23.42	.95
Wash.	80.52	61.97	18.55	140.46	87.68	68.18	19.50	60.28	31.59	28.68	35.21	30.69	4.52
W. Va.	49.48	38.61	10.87	22.94	47.44	41.46	5.99	50.66	39.73	10.93	26.53	22.98	3.56
Wis.	106.04	31.60	74.44	233.02	102.26	50.84	51.42	114.06	38.14	75.92	47.66	41.07	6.59
Wyo.	84.29	69.23	15.06	(4/)	84.86	71.50	13.36	83.44	68.79	14.66	37.47	36.04	1.43

1/ Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both. Money payments may also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments for other than medical care. Averages for general assistance not computed because of difference among States in policy or practice regarding use of general assistance funds to pay medical bills for recipients of the special types of public assistance. 2/ Except for aid to families with dependent children, data for each program represent average payments for recipients of the specified type of assistance under program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 3/ Data for June; later data not available. 4/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients. 5/ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, summary data, October 1964

CURRENT MONTH DATA

Type of benefit	Benefits awarded in October 1964		Benefits in current-payment status, end of October 1964			Amount of benefits paid 1/ in October 1964 (in thousands)
	Number	Average amount	Number	Monthly rate (in thousands)	Average amount	
Total, OASI and DI	270,097	---	---	---	---	$1,359,754
Total, OASI	238,008	---	---	---	---	1,249,142
Monthly benefits, OASI and DI	192,828	---	19,738,834	$1,318,423	---	1,344,141
Monthly benefits, OASI	160,739	---	18,181,194	1,217,996	---	1,233,529
Monthly benefits, DI	32,089	---	1,557,640	100,427	---	110,612
Old-age (retired-worker)	75,722	$81.06	10,627,643	823,286	$77.47	826,556
Disability (disabled-worker)	15,959	95.03	886,287	80,684	91.04	88,188
Wife's or husband's (OASI and DI)	29,248	38.64	2,785,215	110,451	39.66	112,716
Wife's or husband's (OASI)	24,352	39.53	2,605,442	104,668	40.17	106,040
Wife's or husband's (DI)	4,896	34.20	179,773	5,784	32.17	6,676
Widow's or widower's	22,423	73.56	2,136,347	144,615	67.69	149,472
Parent's	246	80.25	36,452	2,548	69.91	2,744
Child's (OASI and DI)	40,975	---	2,796,153	128,922	---	135,064
Child's (OASI--total)	29,741	---	2,304,573	114,963	---	119,316
Child's (OASI--life) 2/	7,098	28.56	426,832	11,996	28.10	12,469
Child's (OASI--survivor) 2/	22,643	52.49	1,877,741	102,967	54.84	106,847
Child's (DI)	11,234	28.77	491,580	13,959	28.40	15,748
Mother's	8,255	61.11	470,737	27,916	59.30	29,401
Lump-sum death payments	77,269	3/215.48	---	---	---	15,613

COMPARATIVE DATA

Item	October 1964	September 1964	October 1963
Number of benefits in current-payment status, end of month:			
Total, OASI and DI	19,738,834	19,702,804	18,957,200
Total, OASI	18,181,194	18,147,299	17,523,202
Total, DI	1,557,640	1,555,505	1,433,998
Amount of benefits paid (in thousands):			
Total, OASI and DI	$1,359,754	$1,365,380	$1,301,536
Total, OASI	1,249,142	1,253,856	1,196,900
Total, DI	110,612	111,524	104,636
Number of old-age (retired-worker) benefits:			
Awarded	75,722	82,839	94,386
In current-payment status, end of month	10,627,643	10,604,611	10,221,778
Average old-age (retired-worker) benefit:			
Awarded	$81.06	$80.80	$79.55
In current-payment status, end of month	77.47	77.45	76.82
Number of disability insurance (disabled-worker) benefits:			
Awarded	15,959	18,815	20,167
In current-payment status, end of month	886,287	883,782	815,172
Average disability insurance (disabled-worker) benefit:			
Awarded	$95.03	$95.73	$94.41
In current-payment status, end of month	91.04	91.02	90.52
Number of persons aged 62 and over receiving monthly benefits, end of month (OASI and DI) 4/	15,440,000	15,403,000	14,841,000
Number of persons aged 65 and over receiving monthly benefits, end of month (OASI and DI) 4/	13,568,000	13,526,000	13,066,000
Assets of trust funds, end of month (in millions):			
OASI	$19,149	$19,984	$18,187
DI	2,152	2,229	2,295

1/ Exceeds monthly amount of benefits in current-payment status because initial payments include amounts payable for prior months. Distribution by type of monthly benefit estimated.
2/ Distribution by type of claim for OASI child's benefits estimated.
3/ Average lump-sum per worker; 72,456 deceased workers represented in the current month's lump-sum awards.
4/ Numbers estimated to the nearest thousand.

Source: Division of the Actuary, Social Security Administration.

ICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

ICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT